A MANUEL OF CONTROVERSIES:

CLEARLY

Demonstrating the truth of Catholique Religion

By { *Texts of holy Scripture,*
Councils of all Ages,
Fathers of the first 500 yeers,
Common sense and reason.

AND

Fully answering the principal Objections of Protestants, and all other Sectaries.

Dedet 1670

By H. Turberville

DEUT. 32. 7.

Remember the old daies, think upon every Generation: ask thy Father, and he will declare to thee; thy Elders, and they will tel thee.

At Doway, by Laurence Kellam. 1654.

TO

The truly Noble, Sir C. F.

Knight and Baronet,

And the perfectly vertuous,

Miſtris S. H.

Dear and honoured friends!

HE *is accounted a good Maſter of* Rhetorick *who can make much of a little: but I think him a better Friend of* Truth *(eſpecially in controverted points) that makes a little of much, by ſumming up the ſubſtance of things diſputed into heads, proving his* Poſitives, *and ſolving others* Negatives, *with ſhort intelligible Arguments and Anſwers, which I have aymed at in this little Manuel. If I have done it well, I have my wiſh; if not, at leaſt accept my endeavour. You were the firſt whoſe patience peruſed it, in a rough*

hand: I have now somewhat smooth'd it by the Presse, and chiefly in obedience to your commands: give me therefore leave to offer it, as a pledge of my affectionate respects to both, under the shadow of your ingenious Patronage: and as you once were pleased to think well of it, being unpolished; so give it your protection, being perfected, and you abundantly shall crown his labours, who is ambitious to be stiled

Honoured Friends,

Your most devoted, and

very humble servant,

H. T.

Henry Turberville D.D
of ye Eng. College of
Douay

To the Reader.

IF the unuſual method of this little Treatiſe ſeem leſſe accommodated to Vulgar capacities (it being indeed the proper form of Schools) at leaſt I hope the matter wil ſo far pleaſe all, and ſuit with all, as to rectifie ſome miſtaken judgments, if not poſſeſſed with too much paſſion, prejudice, or intereſt. That which moved me to draw it in this form, was the deſired ſatisfaction of ſome judicious and ſtrong reaſoning friends, who could not perhaps have ſo eaſily been perſwaded to their own good by any long Rhetorical argumentation, as by this ſhort and ſyllogiſtical way. The wiſhed effect it wrought in them, gives me ſome hope, if ſeriouſly peruſed, it may alſo work the like in many others: the propoſed object of my weak endeavours.

Finding it then agreed by all parties, that Chriſt our Lord hath founded

founded and built a Church in his own blood, which was the onely Mistris of divine faith, and sole Repository of all revealed Truths, at least for an age or two: where can I better initiate my following Arguments, then from the Controversies of the Church, the most important doubtlesse of all others; since on the notion & eviction of her Authority, all other points essentially depend, for their knowledge and decision? My first essay therefore shall be to prove the Roman Catholique Church to be the only true Church of God, by shewing all the most conspicuous marks, and eminent properties of the Church, assigned us by Christ himselfe, to have been verified in her, and none but her. This done, I shall proceed to vindicate her particular and principal doctrines, wherein she hath been most impugn'd by Sectaries.

H. T.

APPROBATIO.

Librum hunc cui Titulus (A Manuel of Controverſies, &c.) *diligenter legi, in quo nihil Ortbodoxæ & Chriſtianæ fidei diſſonum deprehendi; immò methodo facili, compendioſa, & ad docendum accommodata, Veritas Catholica, Catholicis fundamentis ſtabilitur, Hæreſeſque ſolidè, ac erudite in eo refelluntur; ideoque dignum judico, qui in communem utilitatem imprimatur.*

Datum Duaci 14 April. 1654.

Onuphrius Eliſeus *S.T.* Doctor nuper Collegii Anglorum Ulliſiponenſis Profeſſor & Præſes.

Ad

Ad H. T. *post visum* Euchiridion *ipsius.*

PLures singula scripserant, & volumina inflaverant: laborabamus copiâ, & multitudo prolixitasque Scriptorum erat onerosa. Deficientis Protestantiæ lessum Concinentes Scripturas & Patres deesse Catholicis propterea objectabant; quia in tantâ sylvâ non sine venatu emicabant quæ poscebantur. Tempestivus occurris, & *Euchiridion* porrigis, de quo *manum* suam impleat, qui Manipulos colligit. Sive oracula de Cherubinorum superne, sive Sanctorum veneranda suffragia, [illegible] mi spicula flagitaverit, ad [illegible] in manu, tuâ operâ illi adsunt. [illegible] *militiæ Christianæ* per te armatæ; [illegible] *Tui* & verum in Cælis te manentem fructum, & (si qua tibi adeo levis est cura) Ecclesiæ Patriæ plausum & admirationem: *mihi*, posse stare & audire, & gaudio gaudere propter vocem sponsi

Amico tuo

Datum Pridie
Kalendas
Aprilis 1654.

Thomæ ex Albiis East-Saxonum.

APPROBATIO.

Librum, cui titulus à Manuel of Controverſies, *Authore* H. T. *Viro Docto, cordato, probato, hæreo dicere an majore cum guſtu perlegerim, an fructu imbiberim; utrumque æquo Lectori auſim promittere: nimirum inveniet, quiſquis ille fuerit, Fidem Apoſtolicam, Catholicam, Romanam, non ſolum ſartam-tectam ubique cuſtoditam, ſed & Orthodoxis quidem ſuaviter roboratam, Heterodoxis autem, cujuſvis fuerint maniæ, non minus fortiter inculcatam, &, niſi tenebris ſuis immori velint, meridiana luce irradiatam. Habent in hac ſylva Fideles, hinc gladium quo hoſtes feriant, ſcutum inde quo ſeſe protegant, ubique armaturam fidei qua ignea Inferni tela, modo frangant, modo propellant, ſemper ipſi incolumes extinguant: ſed & habent Sectarii ex Scripturis, Conciliis, Patribus Collyria quibus oculos inungant; vident tela ſua facta eſſe ſagittas parvulorum, aut fracta aut retorta, ſemper caſſa: quare vel nova cudant vel laſſum Brontem Steropemque relinquant. Velim magis, arma animoſque ſubmittant, veritati magnæ, prævalenti cedant, Matrique Eccleſiæ ac Deo ſeſe ſuoſque concilient. Prodeat itaque ſæculi noſtri Monitorium Aureum, & non imprimatur duntaxat*

laxat, ſed & manibus *omnium prematur, teratur, quibus vel veneranda arridet Authoritas, vel conſtat Ratio, vel quibus denique cordi ſalus eterna eſt: ſic cenſet, ſic optat*

Ed. *Daniel*, S. Theologiæ Doctor
ejuſdemque Profeſſor.

Datum Duaci Kal. Maiis,
Anno ſalutis hmmanæ,
1654.

A Table of the Contents of the ſeverall Articles.

THe true Church of God demonſtrated by her continued ſucceſſion Article 1. pag. 1

That Proteſtants have no continued ſucceſſion Art. 2. p. 43

The Catholique Churches viſibility aſſerted Art. 3 p. 53

The true Church demonſtrated by her unity and univerſality Art. 4. p. 61

The Churches infallibility demonſtrated Art. 5 p. 68

The true Church demonſtrated by her Sanctity and Miracles Art. 6. p. 82

The Popes ſupremacy aſſerted Art. 7. p. 90

Of Apoſtolical Tradition Art. 8. p. 103

Of Schiſm and Hereſie Art. 9. p. 121

Of the real and ſubſtantial preſence of Chriſts Body and Blood in the Bleſſed Sacrament; wherin the captious Objections of Dr. Taylor *are fully anſwered* Art. 10. p. 127

Of Tranſubſtantiation Art. 11. p. 182

Of Communion under one kind Art. 12. p. 209

Of the unbloody Sacrifice of the Maſſe Art. 13 p. 221

Of the Liturgie and publique prayer in an unknown

known tongue Art.14. p.236
Of Sacramentall Confession and Absolution Art. 15. p.244
Of Purgatory Art.16. p.252
Of Prayer for the dead Art.17. p.258
Of Indulgences Art.18. p.266
Of sin, both mortal and venial Art.19. p.275
Of the worship and Invocation of Angels and Saints Art.20. p.284
Of Reliques Art.21. p.300
Of sacred Images Art.22. p.307
Of Free will Art.23. p.324
Of saving or justifying Faith Art.24. p.333
Of the merit of Works Art.25. p.344
Of Vows Art.26. p.353
Of the possibility of keeping the Commandements Art.27. p.361
Of the Sacraments Art.28. p.368
The Appendix, wherin an unauthentick citation out of Spelman, de Conciliis, (*which is vainly made use of by* Dr. Hammond *and others, to defend their party from Schism, and to prove the nonsubjection of the ancient* Britans *to the See of* Rome) *is clearly confuted* p.401

Errata

ERRATA.

PAge 6.l.13. *Felix.* p.11. l.21. *Altar.* p.24. l. 1. 900. p.27.l.8,9. *Lateran Council under P. Nich.2. Anno* 1057 l.10 *penances.* & l.16. *Simeon.* p.33.l.4. *Suſo.* p.54. l.18. (*his Church*) p.58.l.26. *connexion.* p.59.l.11. *parity.* p.83. l.13. *Epheſ.*5.27.p.85.l.9. *multitude.* & l.27. *Mark* 16.17. p.86.l.12. *Aſſiſium.* p.109.l.5. I *frame* my. p.119. l.12. all *divinely.* p.123.l.23. *defined.* p.141.l.4. *lively.* p.160. l.21. 1 *Cor.*11.p.168,l.8. *bring.* p.172. l.13. *do not you.* p. 187.l.2. -fore *no.* p.190.l.14. *the bread his body.* p.199. l. 5. *time* being- p.238.l.8. you *all* to-: p.277.l.20. the *laſt.* p.372.l:17. ſalvation *is neceſſary*, as. & l. 21. dele *is neceſſary.* p.407. l.14. bfuddddod.

A MANUEL OF CONTROVERSIES.

ARTICLE I.

The true Church of God demonſtrated by her continued Succeſſion.

OUr Tenet is, *That the Church now in Communion with the Sea of* Rome, *is the only true Church of God*: which we prove thus.

The Argument.

1. *Major.* That is the only true Church of God, which has had a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time.

2. *Minor.* But the Church now in Communion with the Sea of *Rome*, and no other, has had a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time.

3. *Concluſion.* Therfore the Church now in

communion with the Sea of *Rome*, and no other, is the true Church of God.

The *Major*, or first Proposition, is proved out of the Prophets and promises of Christ.

My Spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, and out of the mouth of thy seed for ever. Isa. 59. 21. *Arise, be illuminated, O Hierusalem, because thy light is come, &c. and the Gentiles shall walk in thy light, &c. and thy Gates shall be open continually day and night, they shall not be shut, that the strength of the Gentiles may be brought to thee, &c.* Isa. 60 1, 3, 11. *Upon thy wals, O Hierusalem, I have appointed Watchmen all the day, and all the night for ever, they shall not hold their peace.* Isa. 62. 6. *An everlasting Covenant shall be to them, I will found them, and multiply them, and give my Sanctification in the midst of them for ever,* Ezech. 37. 26. *All Nations, Tribes, and Tongues, shall serve him, his power is an eternall power that shall not be taken away, and his kingdom shall not be corrupted,* Dan. 7. 13, 14.

Go ye, teaching all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. And behold I am with you all daies, even to the consummation of the world, S. Math. 28. 20. *I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclite, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth,* S. John 14. 16. *Christ gave some Apostles,*

some

A MANUEL OF CONTROVERSIES.

ARTICLE I.

The true Church of God demonſtrated by her continued Succeſſion.

OUr Tenet is, *That the Church now in Communion with the Sea of* Rome, *is the onely true Church of God*; which we prove thus.

The Argument.

1. *Major.* That is the only true Church of God, which has had a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time, and ſhall have from hence to the end of the world.
2. *Minor.* But the Church now in Communion with the Sea of *Rome*, and no other, has had a continued Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time, and conſequently ſhall have to the end of the world.
3. *Conſequence.* Therefore the Church now in com-

munion with the Sea of Rome, and no other, is the true Church of God.

The *Major*, or first Propoſition, is proved out of the Prophets and promiſes of Chriſt.

My Spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put into thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, and out of the mouth of thy ſeed, and out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, from henceforth, and for ever, ſaith the Lord, Iſa. 59. 21. And again, *Ariſe, be illuminated, O Hieruſalem, becauſe thy light is come, &c. and the Gentiles ſhall walk in thy light, &c. and thy Gates ſhall be open continually day and night, they ſhall not be ſhut, that the ſtrength of the Gentiles may be brought to thee, and their Kings may be brought, &c.* Iſa. 60. 1. 3. 11. *Upon thy walls, O Hieruſalem, I have appointed Watchmen all the day, and all the night for ever, they ſhall not hold their peace,* Iſa. 62. 6. *An everlaſting Covenant ſhall be to them, I will found them, and multiply them, and give my Sanctification in the midſt of them for ever,* Ezechiel 37. 26. *All Nations, Tribes, and Tongues, ſhall ſerve him, his power is an eternal power that ſhall not be taken away, and his Kindome ſhall not be corrupted,* Dan. 7. 13, 14.

Go ye teaching all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, &c. And behold I am with you all daies, even to the conſummation of the world, S. Mat. 28. 20. *I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclite, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth,* S. John 14. 16. *Chriſt gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome*

some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors, some Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, &c. until we all meet in the unity of Faith, &c. that now we be not children wavering and carried about with every Wind of doctrine, Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14.

The *minor*, or second Proposition of the Argument is proved by this ensuing Catalogue of the Roman Churches chief Pastors, Councils, Nations converted, and publique Professors of her Faith.

From the year of Christ 30.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
30 Our *B. Saviour Jesus Christ.*	The Council of the Apostles at Hierusalem, S. *Peter* presiding, *Acts* 15.
34 *S. Peter Apostle.*	
69 *Linus.* according to ye Popish succession must be Superior to St. John the Beloved Apost. if their doct. be true of ye Primacy of Rome.	
80 *Cletus.*	
93 *Clement.*	

From the year 100.

103 *Anacletus.*
112 *Euaristus.*
121 *Alexander.*
132 *Sixtus* 1.
142 *Telesphorus.*

154 *Higinius.*
158 *Pius* 1.
165 *Anicetus.*
175 *Soter.*
179 *Eleutherius.*
194 *Victor.*

127 } Three
143 } accts of
158 } Pius Gn

In this first Age or Century after *Jesus Christ*, we find the primacie in S. *Peter*, as is manifest by the said Councel in the Acts, where (after a serious debate, whether the Jewish Ceremonies ought to be impos'd on the Gentiles) S. *Peter* defined in the Negative, saying; *Men, brethren, you know that of old, God amongst us chose, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the Word of the Gospel, and believe, and God who knoweth the hearts gave testimony, giving to them the Holy Ghost, as well as to us, and hath put no difference between them and us, by faith purifying their hearts; now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the necks of the Disiples, which neither our Forefathers, nor we have been able to bear?* Acts 15. 7, 8, 9, 10.

S. *James* (who was Bishop of the place) seconding by his sentence what *Peter* had decreed. *All the multitude* (saith S. *Hierome*) *held their peace, and into his* (Peters) *sentence*, James *the Apostle, and all the Priests did pass together*, Epist. 89. to August. s. 2. *Peter* (saith he in the same place) *was Prince and Author of the Decree.* That S. *Peter* translated his Chair from *Antioch* to *Rome*, is proved. First, because

because he remained not alwayes at *Antioch*, as all that Church acknowledgeth, nor did she ever challenge the first Chair in any General Councel, as appears in the Councels. Secondly, by the Decrees of Councels, Popes, and other Fathers, giving the primacy to the Roman Church.

The Councel of *Sardis* (*An. Dom.* 400. Western Fathers 300. Eastern 76.) decreed, *That in cases of Bishops for the honor of S.* Peters *memory, it should be lawful to appeal from whatsoever other Bishop to the Bishop of Rome*, Can. 3.

The Councel of *Calcedon* (*An. Dom.* 451. Fathers 600.) *We throughly consider truly, that all primacy and chief honor, according to the Canons, is to be kept for the Arch-bishop of old Rome.* Action 16. And in the relation of the said Councel to Pope *Leo, We have confirmed* (say they) *the rule of the* 150. *Fathers* in the first Constantinopolitan Councel *Anno* 381. *which hath commanded, that after the most holy and Apostolique Sea* (of Rome) *the Constantinopolitan should have honor.* Pope *Antherus, Anno* 238. (being asked by the Bishops of *Bettica* and *Toletum*, whether it were lawful for a Bishop to be changed from one City to another?) answer'd affirmatively, as *Peter* (Prince of the Apostles) was chang'd from *Antioch* to *Rome*. *Decret.* 7. *q.* 1. And S. *Greg.* sayes, *He knows no Bishop but is subject to the Sea of* Rome, *Epist.* 62.

the first Central Counsel of Nice ordered that y last Appeale should be made to the Counsel of Bishops assembled twice a year in every Province & ergo not to y Pope. And y end of this 5. Canon in that Counsel is very remarkable. The one Counsel of the Bishops to be held the Quadragesima before Easter, That all dissention being taken away, we might offer a most pure gift to God. whereas if after the Sentence of the Counsel the business were to be carried to y court of Rome, Suits & Quarrels would not be Ended ag.t Easter, but longer protracted, especially in Remote Countryes.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 100.

THe B. *Virgin*, S. *John Baptiſt*, S. *John Evangeliſt*, &c. *Martha*, *Magdalen*, S. *Paul*, S. *Steven*, *Timothy*, *Barnabas*, *Tecla*, *Dennis*, *Martial*, *Ignatius*, *Clement*, &c. The Church was ſpread in this Age over all thoſe Countryes to which S. *Paul* wrote his Epiſtles; as alſo *France*, *Spain*, *England*, &c. See *Baronius*.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 200.

EVſtachius, *Hermes*, *Getulius*, *Policarpe*, *Concordius*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Euſebius*, *Irænus*, *Vincentius*, *Potentianus*, *Sophia*, *Fides*, *Spes*, *Charitas*, S. *Felicity*, with her ſeven children, *Lucius* King of England, &c.

The Apoſtles Canons define, *That if any Biſhop or Prieſt* (*the Oblation* (Maſs) *being made*) *ſhall not communicate, he ſhould be excommunicate, as giving ſuſpition of him who hath ſacrificed, that he hath not offered rightly offered.* Can. 9. approved in the ſixth Generall Synod.

An.

From the year of Christ 200.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
204 *Zepherinus.*	
221 *Calixtus.* 1.	
227 *Urbanus.* 1.	
223 *Pontianus.*	
238 *Antherus.*	
239 *Fabianus.*	
254 *Cornelius.*	
255 *Lucius.*	
257 *Stephanus.* 1.	
260 *Sixtus.* 2.	
261 *Dionisius.* 1.	
273 *Fælix.* 1.	
275 *Eutychianus.*	
284 *Caius.*	
296 *Marcellinus.*	

's decr. was contested & he acquainted the Cr. Bps with his case.

deposed for offg incense to Saturn, Jupiter &c +

The second and third Ages, (whether by reason of the Churches great persecutions, or the not stirring of any famous Heretiques) produced no Councels, yet a Succession of Popes, Martyrs and Confessors we have, which is sufficient for our purposes?

The Decrees of Popes in these Ages.

Anacletus Decreed, *That Priests, when they sacrifice to our Lord, must not do it alone, but have wi-*

+ Baxter 162

ſſes with them, that they may be proved to have ſacrificed perfectly to God in ſacred places, &c. ſo the Apoſtles have appointed, and the Roman Church holds. 1. Epiſt. de conſecrat. d. 1. c. Epiſcopus. And in the end of the ſame Epiſtle; *If more difficult queſtions ſhall ariſe, let them be refer'd to the Apoſtolique Sea of* (Rome) *for ſo the Apoſtles have ordained by the command of our Lord.* An. Dom. 101.

Alexander decreed, *That Bread only, and Wine mingled with Water, ſhould be offer'd in the ſacrifice of the Maſs. Epiſt. Orthod. de conſec. d. 2. c. in Sacrament,*

Sixtus decreed, *That the ſacred myſteries* (the B. Euchariſt) *and ſacred Veſſels ſhould not be touched, but by ſacred Miniſters, and that the Prieſt beginning Maſs, the people ſhould ſing Holy! Holy! Holy! &c.* in his Epiſt. to all the faithful of Chriſt, *Anno Dom.* 129.

Teleſphorus commanded the ſeven weeks of Lent to be faſted, *Epiſt. Decret. Anno Dom.* 139.

Pius in his Epiſtle to the Italians, enjoyned penance for him, by whoſe negligence any of the Bloud of our Lord ſhould be ſpilt. *q. 1. c. Qui compulſus. An. D.* 147.

Anicetus tells us, That *James* was made Biſhop of Jeruſalem by S. *Peter, James* and *John*, in his decretal Epiſt. to the Biſhops of France, and cites *Anacletus* for it. *Epiſt. 2. diſt. 25. c. Prohibet fratres.*

Soter decreed, *That no man ſhould ſay Maſs after he had eaten or drunk.* De conſec. diſt. 1. c. *Ut illud.*

Zephe-

Zepherinus decreed, *That the greater cauſes of the Church are to be determined by the Apoſtolique Sea, becauſe ſo the Apoſtles, and their Succeſſors had ordain'd.* Epiſt. to the Biſhops of Sicily, 217.

Theſe were all Popes of *Rome*, but no true *Proteſtants*, I hope.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 300.

S*Implicius, Callepodius, Abdon, Sennen, Pamachius, Tyburtius, Valerianus, Marcellinus, Dorotheus, Gordianus, Pudentiana, Triphon, Blaſius, Maximianus, Clemens, Barbara, Agatha, Apollonia, Cyprianus, Hyppolitus, Gregorius, Thaumaturgus, Laurentius, Tharſus, Cecilia, Victorius, Nemeſius, Olympius, Adrianus, Georgius, Pantaleon, Agnes, Barlaam, Gereon,* with his companions, *Coſmas, Damianus, Mauritius,* with the Theban Legion, &c.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 400.

D*Omnus* with 2000. Martyrs, *Lucianus, Theodorus, Paul* the firſt Eremite, *Jacobus Niſſibitanus, Spiridion, Macharius, Nicholaus, Helena* (the Mother of *Conſtantine* the Great) *Conſtantine* (the firſt Chriſtian Emperour) *Marcus, Arethuſius, Nycetas, Theodorus, Antonius, Hilarion, Athanaſius, Paulus Conſtantinopolitanus, Hilarius, Martianus, Baſilius,*

Basilius, Hieronimus, Epiphanius, Patianus, Ambrose, Cyril of Hierusalem, &c.

Nations converted.

Dacians, Gebes, Bessites, Scythians, Morines, Armenians, Hunnes, Indians, Ethiopians, &c.

From the year of Christ 300.

	Chief Pastors.	General Councels.
304	*Marcellus.*	The 1. *Nicene Councel* (Fathers 328.) approved by Pope *Sylvester*, *An. Dom.* 325. against *Arrius.* Authors, *Cedrenus, Potius, Socrates, Eusebius.*
309	*Eusebius.*	
312	*Melchiades.*	
314	*Sylvester.*	
336	*Malchus.*	
337	*Julius.*	
352	*Liberius.*	The 1. *Constantinopolitan Councel* (Fathers 150.) Pope *Damasus* presiding, *Anno Dom.* 381. against *Macedonius.* Authors, *Socrates, Photius, Baronius.*
358	*Felix.* 2.	
367	*Damasus.*	
385	*Siricius.*	
398	*Anastasius.*	

From the year 400.

402	*Innocentius* 1.	The 1. *Ephesine Councel*, (Fathers 200.) Pope *Celestine* presiding, *Anno Dom.* 431. against *Nestor.* Authors, *Nicephorus, Baronius.*
417	*Sozimus.*	
419	*Bonifacius.* 1.	
424	*Celestinus.* 1.	
432	*Sixtus.* 3.	
440	*Leo Magnus.*	

461 *Hilarius.*
468 *Simplicius.*
483 *Felix.*
492 *Gelaſius.* 1.
497 *Anaſtaſius.* 2.
499 *Symmachus.*

The *Calcedon Councel*, (Fathers 600.) Pope *Leo* preſiding, *Anno Dom.* 451. againſt *Eutyches*.
Authors, *Leo, Epiſt.* 50. *Baronius, &c.*

Anno Dom. 500.

The 1. *Nicene Councel* defined againſt *Arrius*, *That the Son of God is conſubſtantial to his Father, and true God.*

2. *That he who holds the Sea of* Rome, *is the Head and chief of all the Patriarchs, ſeeing he is the firſt, as* Peter, *to whom power* (Eccleſiaſtical) *is given over all Chriſtian Princes, and all their people, &c. and whoever ſhall contradict this, is excommunicated by the Synod.* Can. 39. Arab.

3. *That by Baptiſm a man is freed from the ſervitude and corruption of ſin,* l. 3. decret.

4. *That the Lamb of God, which takes away the ſins of the world, is placed on the ſacred Table* (the Author) *to be ſacrificed by the Prieſt unbloudily, and that we receiving his precious body and bloud, do believe theſe things to be ſignes of our Reſurrection,* l. 3. decret. *de Divina menſa.*

It decreed, *That a Biſhop dying, notice ſhall be given of his death, to all Churches and Monaſteries in the Pariſh, that prayer be made for him,* c. 65. Arabico. And, *that Deacons* (*who have no power to offer Sacrifice*) *ought not to give the Body and Bloud of Chriſt to Prieſts, who have ſuch power,* Can. 14.

The

The 1. *Constantinop. Councel* defined against *Macedonius*, who denied the Holy Ghost to be God, and decreed the Bishop of *Constantinople* to be chief, next the Bishop of *Rome*.

The 1. *Ephesine Councel* defined against *Nestor*, who deni'd the B. Virgin to be the Mother of God, *c.* 1. 2. 3. 4.

It defined, that S. *Peter* was the Head and Prince of the Apostles, and that the Power of loosing and binding sins, was given by our Lord to S. *Peter*, who (in his Successors) lives and exercises Judgment to this very time, and alwayes, *A*[illegible].3.

The Councel of *Calcedon* defined against *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus*, who deni'd two natures in Christ, affirming, that the humane nature was chang'd into the Divinity. In the third action of this Councel, Pope *Leo* is called Universal Archbishop and Patriarch of old *Rome*, and sentence is pronounced against *Dioscorus* in the names of *Leo*, and S. *Peter*, to acknowledg *Leo* to be S. *Peters* Successor.

The *Eleberine Councel* in Spain, subscribed by *Osius*, and others, who were present at the first *Nicene Councel*, defined, that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons should abstain from their wives, or else be degraded, c. 33. Age the 4.

The 2. Councel at *Arles* under Pope *Sylvester* defined, that no man, who was married, could be made a Priest, unless a conversion wtre promised. *Can.* 2.

Ca-

Catholike Profeſſors to the yéar 500.

S*Everinus, Tigrius, Exuperius, Eutropius, S. John Chryſoſtom, Paulinus, Mauritius, S. Auguſtine, Maximus, Soſimus, Vincentius Lyrinenſis, Jacobus Perſa, Alexius, S. Cyril of Alexandria, Urſula with* 11000 *Virgins, Proſper, Honoratus, Palladius, Bonifacius, Euthimius, Simon Stelites, Chryſologus, Patricius, Eugenius, Fulgentius, Boetius, Epiphanius Tycinenſis, Severinus, &c.*

The Scots converted by *Palladius*, the French by S. *Remigius* and *Veduſtus*. 4979. Martyrs of *Africa*, and many others.

From the year of Chriſt 500.

Chief Paſtors.	General Councels.
514 *Hormiſda.*	
524 *Joannes* 1.	The 2. *Conſtantinopolitan* Councel, Pope *Vigilius* preſiding (Fathers 165. *Anno Domini* 553.) againſt *Anthimius*, and *Theodore*.
526 *Felix* 4.	
530 *Bonifacius* 2.	
532 *Joannes* 2.	
535 *Agapetus.*	
537 *Sylverius.*	
540 *Vigilius.*	Authors, *Zonorus, Nicephorus*, and *Baronius*.
556 *Pelagius* 1.	
560 *Joannes* 3.	

573

573 *Benedictus.* 1.
578 *Pelagius.* 2.
590 *Gregorius Magnus.*

Roman See vacant 4 months.

This 2. Constantinopolitan Council defined, *That our Lord Jesus Christ crucified in the flesh, is both the true Lord of glory, and one of the Holy Trinity.* Can. 10. against *Peter* the Arch-bishop of Constantinople, who held, That the whole Trinity was crucified for us, as appears, *Acts* 1.

It defined, *One Divine Nature to be in all the three Persons.* Can. 1. *Two Nativities in Christ.* c. 2 *One only Person to be in Christ, though two distinct Natures,* against *Anthimius* and *Theodore.* Can. 4. 5.

It defined against *Theodore, That Christ was not troubled with passions of the mind, or concupiscenses of the flesh.* Can. 12.

In this Age, the third Council of *Carthage* decreed, That the *Sacraments of the Altar* (Mass) *should not be celebrated, but by such only as were fasting.* Can. 29. It approved the *Whole Catalogue of Canonical Books by name, as they are now published in our Bible, and approved by the Catholike Church,* (except only *Baruch,* which is not named, because an Appendix to *Jeremie,* whose Secretary he was) Can. 47. This Council was subscribed by S. *Augustine,* and approved in the sixth General Synod.

In this Age, the *Milevitan Council* defined, That *whoever denies children newly born to be baptized, or sayes they contract nothing of original sin from* Adam, *which*

which may be cleanſed by the Laver of Regeneration, &c. Anathema. c. 2. it was ſubſcribed by S. *Auguſtine.*

In this Age the *Cæſarauguſtan Councel* decreed, *That Virgins* (who had vow'd themſelves to God) *ſhould not be vailed, till after forty years probation.*

In this Age Pope *John* 1. decreed, *That Maſſe ought not to be celebrated, but in places conſecrated to our Lord, unleſs great neceſſity ſhould enforce it.* In his Epiſt. to the Biſhops of divers places, giving this reaſon, *Becauſe it is written, ſee thou offer not thy Holocauſts in every place, but in the place which thy Lord thy God hath choſen,* Deut. 12. *An.* 525. For as no others but Prieſts conſecrated to our Lord, ought to ſing Maſſes, and offer Sacrifices to our Lord upon the Altars, ſo in no other but conſecrated places. *De Conſecrat. diſt.* 1. *c. Sicut non alii.*

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 600.

GErardus, *Genouefa*, *Columbus*, *Oportuna*, *Germanus Pariſienſis*, *Mary* of *Egypt*, *Brigitta*, *Simeon Salus*, *Leander*, *S. Benedict.* (inſtitutor of the Holy Order of Benedictine Monks) *Rupertus*, *Maurus*, *Placidus*, *Arnulphus*, *Radegundis*. *Leonard*, *Columbanus*, *John Climachus*, *Iſaac*, *Hermenigildus*, *Fortunatus*, *Agricola*, *Bonifacius*, *Victor*, *Elutherius*, *Gregorius Turonenſis*, *&c.*

Nations

Nations converted.

S. *Auguſtine* the Monk, ſent by Pope *Gregory*, converted England. The Northern *Picts*, *Gothes*, *Bavarians*, and *Burgundians*, were alſo converted in this Age.

From the year of Chriſt 600.

Chief Paſtors.	General Councels.
605 *Sabinianus.*	The 3. Conſtantinopolitan Councell. Fathers 289. Pope *Agatho* preſiding. *An Dom.* 680. againſt the Monothelites.
606 *Bonifacius* 3.	
615 *Deuſdedit.*	
618 *Bonifacius* 4.	
626 *Honorius.*	
639 *Severinus.*	
640 *Joannes* 4.	
642 *Theodorus* 1.	
649 *Martinus* 1.	Authors, *Cedrenus*, *Baronius*, *&c.*
654 *Eugenius.*	
655 *Vitalianus.*	
669 *Adeodatus.*	
676 *Domnus* 1.	
678 *Agatho.*	
683 *Leo* 2.	
684 *Benedictus* 2.	
685 *Johannes* 5.	
686 *Conon.*	
688 *Sergius.*	

In

In this 6. Age, in the 3. Councel of *Constantinople*, celebrated in *Trullo*, were condemned, *Sergius*, *Paulus*, *Petrus*, *Cyrus*, and *Theodore*, who most impiously taught, but one will and operation to be in Christ.

It defined, under *Anathema*, *That all things should be held, which had been defined in the first six General Councils, together with 85. Canons, called the Apostles Canons, and certain other Provincial Councils there specified.* Can. 1. 2.

It defined, *That no Priest, Deacon, or Subdeacon, after they had taken Orders, could marry*, c. 6. and this in conformity to the Apostles Canons, (*Can.* 27.) where they commanded, *That none but Lectors and Cantors should marry, after they had received Orders.*

It decreed, *that grapes* (an abusive custome in some places) *should not be given to the people, together with that unbloudy Sacrifice of the Oblation.* Can. 28. de consec. distinct. 2. *Verbo didicimus.*

It decreed, *That water ought to be mingled with the Wine in the unbloudy Sacrifice of the Mass, according to S.* James *the Brother of our Lord, and Bishop of* Hierusalem *in his mystical Sacrifice delivered to us* (say they) *in writing. De consecrat. distin.* 1. *verbo Jacobus, c.* 32. Contrary to the Heresies of the *Hydroparastes*, who consecrated in water only, & of the *Armenians*, who did it in wine only.

It decreed, *That we ought to give inferiour adoration to the Cross, and forbad it to be made on pavements, for reverence sake.* Can. 73.

It decreed, *That such as have received power*

from God to loose and bind, ought attentively to consider the quality of the sin, and the disposition of the sinner, that so they may apply a fit remedy for the disease, lest, if they judg of the sin without difference, they hinder the health of the sick part, Can. 102. This required confession, and a particular knowledge of the sins to be absolved.

It decreed, that *a Christian adoring only God his Creator, may invocate Saints, that they would vouchsafe to pray for him to the Divine Majesty.* c. 7.

Catholike Professors to the year 700.

Anastasius, Persa, Walburga, Attala, Eustatius, Joannes Climosinarius, Isidorus, Claudius, Theodorus, Arnulphus, Aldegund, Eligius, Severus, Cæsarius, Maximus, Oswaldus, Odoenus, Lambertus, Guagericus, Anhelmus, Betulphus, Berta, Cunibertus, Aidanus, Cuthbertus, Julianus, Marinus, Eugenius, the two *Edwaldies, Andonius, Damianus, Tienensis, Killianus, Joannes Bergonienſis, Cedda, Projectus Paulinus,* with divers others.

Nations converted.

The *Flemins* converted by *Eligius*, the *Westphalians* by the two *Edwaldies*, the *Franconians* by *Killianus*; multitudes of the *Spaniards* by *Andonius*, the *Frisians* by *Willebrord.*

From

From the year of Christ 700.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
702 *Johannes* 6.	The 2. Nicene Council; Fathers 350. Pope *Adrian* presiding: *An. Dom.* 787. against Image-breakers.
705 *Joannes* 7.	
708 *Sisimus.* } *Constantius.* }	
714 *Gregorius* 2.	
731 *Gregorius* 3.	
742 *Zacharias.*	
752 *Stephanus* 2. } *Stephanus* 3. }	
757 *Paulus* 1.	
768 *Stephanus* 4.	
772 *Adrianus.*	
796 *Leo* 3.	

Authors, *Sedrenus*, *Zonoras*, *Baronius*.

This second *Nicene Council* in the second Action, approved the Epistle of *Pope Adrian* to *Tarasius* the Patriark, in which he teaches the Roman Church to be the Head of all Churches.

In the third Action it receives and approves the Apostolical Tradition of the Church, by which veneration and worship of the Saints is taught, viz. as the servants, children, and friends of God; *With these also* (say they) *we worship the reliques of Martyrs, and holy Images of Christ and his Saints, since we know* (according to the sentence of *Basil*

the Great) *honor exhibited to the image, redounds to the prototype.*

In the sixth *Action Tom.* 1. it declares the Constantinopolitan Synod (under *Leo* the Heretical Emperor) which condemned images, to be no true Synod, because neither the Pope, nor his Legates, nor the Eastern Patriarchs were present at it.

In the seventh *Action*, it approves the first six General Councils, defining *all to be Heretiques whom they condemn for such: as also that the images of Christ, the B. Virgin, the Angels and all the Saints ought to be dedicated and kept in the holy Temples of God, that by them we might come into the memory of the prototypes.* It defines likewise, *that we may give the said images a salutation or honorary worship, not that true* Latria (or Soveraign honor) *which we give to God only; so the Discipline of our Forefathers, or Tradition of the Catholique Church teacheth.* Thus the Council.

And again, *We confess with one consent, that we will keep Ecclesiastical Traditions, whether by writing, or custome, being in force, and decreed, &c. Who shall dare to think or teach otherwise, or (after the custome of wicked Heretiques) violate Ecclesiastical Traditions, let him be excommunicate,* Acts the 7. p. 686. Tom. 3.

In the same Age the Council of *Sens* decreed, *That it was a dangerous thing to be in that errour, that nothing is to be admitted which is not drawn from*

from Scripture; for many things are derived from Christ to posterity, by the hands of the Apostles, from mouth to mouth, &c. which are to be holden without all doubt. Decret. 5.

Catholike Professors to the year 800.

VEnerable *Bede*, *Bonitus*, *Grimaldus Guthalchus*, *Joannes Damascenus*, *Germanus*, *Winocus*, *Herminigildus*, *Bonifacius*, *Plectrudis*, *Lioba*, *Iodocus*, *Odillia*, *Gertrudis*, *Hubertus*, *Lullus Burchardus*, and many others.

Nations converted.

The *Hassites*, *Thuringians*, *Erphordians*, and *Cattians*, converted by *Boniface* the English Monk; the *Lombards* by *Sebaldus*; the *Jews* in the City of *Berito* by the bleeding of a *Crucifix*, which was stab'd by them, the bloud whereof cured diseases; the two Saxon Dukes, *Withkindus* and *Albion* converted by a miraculous sight of the B. Sacrament.

From the year of Christ 800.

	Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
816	*Stephanus* 5.	
817	*Paschasius* 1.	
824	*Eugenius.*	

827 *Valentinus.*
828 *Gregorius* 4.
844 *Sergius* 2.
847 *Leo* 4.
855 *Benedictus* 3.
858 *Nicolaus* 1.
868 *Adrianus* 2.
873 *Joannes* 8.
883 *Martinus* 2.
884 *Adrianus* 3.
885 *Stephanus* 6.
891 *Formosus.*
897 *Bonifacius* 6.
900 *Stephanus* 7. *Romanus.*

The fourth Constantinopolitan Council, (Fathers 101.) Pope *Adrian* presiding, *An. Dom.* 869. against *Photius.*

Authors, *Nicephorus, Platina, Baronius.*

In this fourth Constantinopolitan Council *Photius* was condemn'd for usurping the Chair of *Constantinople*, and expelling *Ignatius* the lawful Bishop; as also for disobeying the authority and Decrees of the Apostolique Sea of old *Rome*, *Action* 1.

In this Council they recited the Acts of a Synod, made by *Adrian* Pope of Rome, upon the very intrusion of *Photius* into that Chair; and in *Adrians* third address to the Synod, his words are, *We have read that the Bishop of Rome hath judged the Bishops of all Churches, but we have not read that any one hath judged him.* In the same Epistle was read the definition of Pope *Adrian* in the said *Roman*

man Council, against that unlawful Council at Constantinople, called by *Photius* (*Michael* the tyrant being Emperour) and all the Acts thereof, condemning them to the fire, &c. The whole Epistle was approved and ratified with a new *Anathema* by this Council, *Action* 7.

It condemned the said *Photius* and his Council, against Images, *Action* 8.

It commanded the definitions against *Photius* and his Councils to be observed, *Can.* 1.

It defined, *That the Images of Christ and his Saints are to be worshipped with a certain relative worship*, Can. 3.

It declared *Photius never to have been a Bishop*, Can. 6.

It decreed, *That temporal Princes ought to honor the holy Patriarches, and especially the most holy Pope of old Rome, next the Constantinopolitan, then the Patriarch of Antioch, and lastly of Hierusalem.* Can. 21.

It defined under Anathema, *That no temporal Prince, or Lay-man, should meddle in the election or promotion of Patriarchs, Metropolitans, or Bishops, as having no power at all therein*, Can. 22.

It approved all the seven former General Councils.

It anathematized *Photius* for the causes above-mentioned, *Can.* 6.

Catholique Professors to the year 600.

Sabinus, Ansgratius, Ludgerus, Gerfridus, Gerol-dus, Joannicius, Ida, Nicetas Menolphus, With-gungus, Adelardus, Mervardus, Rumoldus, Ausga-rus, Rembertus, Withinus, Atalphus, Seinandus, and many others.

Nations converted.

The *Danes* and *Swedes* converted by *Ansgratius*, the *Bulgarians* by *Joannicius*, the *Rugians* by the Monks of *Corbeia*; the *Moratians* by *Withgungus*, the *Russites* by a Priest sent by the Emperour *Basilius*.

From the year of Christ 900.

	Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
901	*Theodorus* 2. *Ioannes* 9.	
905	*Benedictus* 4.	
907	*Leo* 5.	
608	*Christopherus*. *Sergius* 3.	
910	*Anastasius* 2.	
912	*Laudo*. *Iohannes* 9.	

928

928 *Leo* 6.
929 *Stephanus* 8.
931 *Ioannes* 11.
936 *Leo* 7.
940 *Stephanus* 9.
943 *Agapitus* 2.
956 *Ioannes* 12.
965 *Benedictus* 5.
966 *Ioannes* 13.
972 *Domnus* 2.
973 *Benedictus* 6.
975 *Benedictus* 7.
984 *Ioannes* 14.
985 *Ioannes* 15.
995 *Ioannes* 16.
996 *Gregorius* 5.
999 *Sylveſter* 2.

In this tenth Age, or Century, I find no General Councel, nor yet Provincial, in which any controverſie of moment was decided, a Succeſſion of Chief Paſtors, and ſome Nations converted we have.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 1000.

ODo *Cluniacenſis*, *Wenceſlaus*, *Adalricus*, *Bruno Colonienſis*, *Guibertus*, *Majolus*, *Dunſtanus*, *Romoaldus*, *Elphegus*, *Adelheidis*, *Wolfangus*, *Poppo*, *Ber-*

Bernaldus, *Adelbertus*, *Ægidius*, *Tusculanus*, and many others.

Nations converted.

The *Polonians* converted by *Ægidius Tusculanus*, sent by Pope *John* 13. The *Sclavonians* converted by *Adelbert*; the *Hungarians* converted by another *Adelbert*.

From the year 1000.

	Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
1003	*Joannes* 17. } *Joannes* 18. }	
1009	*Sergius* 4.	
1012	*Benedictus* 8.	
1024	*Johannes* 19.	
1034	*Benedictus* 9.	
1044	*Gregorius* 6.	
1047	*Clemens* 2.	
1048	*Damasus* 2.	
1049	*Leo* 9.	
1055	*Victor* 2.	
1058	*Stephanus* 10.	
1059	*Nicolaus* 2.	
1061	*Alexander* 2.	
1073	*Gregorius* 7.	
1086	*Victor* 3.	
1088	*Urbanus* 2.	
1090	*Paschalis* 2.	

In

In this eleventh Age, about the year 1049. *Berengarius* an Arch-Deacon of *Ghent*, began to broach his Hereſie concerning the B. Sacrament, affirming it to be only a ſign, or figure of the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, not his true Body and Bloud; for which he was condemned in the Council of *Vercellus*, under Pope *Leo* 9. 1053. As alſo in the Roman Council under Pope *Gregory* 7. *Anno* 1073. where he abjur'd his Hereſie in open Council, and died a Catholique, after divers penance done for his ſin. See *Gulielmus Bibliothecarius*, *l. de geſtis Anglorum.*

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 1100.

Odilo Cluniacenſis, *Henricus* the Emperour, *Kunigundis* his wife, *Colomanus*, *Petrus Damianus*, *Oddas*, *Simeo* the Eremite, *Brado*, *Dominicus*, *Loricatus*, *Gothardus*, *Edwardus*, *Wigbertus*, *Lanfrancus*, *Gerardus Gaudauenſis*, *Anſelmus*, *Staniſlaus*, *Anſwerus*, *Godfridus Ambianenſis*, *Ivo*, *Bruno Carthuſianus*, *Hugo Cluniacenſis*, *Hugo Gratianopolitanus*, *&c.*

The *Vindicians* and *Pruſſians* converted.

From

From the year 1100.

Chief Paſtors.	General Councels.
1118 *Gelaſius* 2.	1. *Lateran Councel* (Fathers 300.) for inſtauration of Diſcipline, Pope *Calixtus* 2. preſiding. *Anno* 1122. Authors *Sugerius, Platina, Onuphrius, Baronius.*
1119 *Calixtus* 2.	
1125 *Honorius* 2.	
1130 *Innocentius* 2.	
1143 *Celeſtinus* 2.	2. *Lateran Councel* (Fathers 1000.) for the right of the Clergy. *Innocent* the 2. preſiding. *Anno* 1139. Authors, *Platina, Onuphrius, Baronius.*
1144 *Lucius* 2.	
1145 *Eugenius* 3.	
1154 *Anaſtaſius* 4.	
1155 *Adrianus* 4.	
1160 *Alexander* 3.	The 3. *Lateran Councel* (Fathers 300.) for reformation, Pope *Alexander* the 3. preſiding. *An. Do.* 1179. Authors the ſame, as before.
1182 *Lucius* 3.	
1185 *Urbanus* 3.	
1187 *Gregorius* 8.	
1188 *Clemens* 3.	
1191 *Celeſtinus* 3.	
1198 *Innocentius* 3.	

The two firſt *Lateran Councels* defined little in matters of controverſie. The third condemn'd *Waldenſis* the Merchant of *Lions*, who taught the Apoſtles were Laymen, that Laymen and women might conſecrate and preach, that Clergy-men ought to have no poſſeſſions or properties, that oaths were unlawful in all caſes, that Prieſts and Magiſtrates by mortal ſin fell from their dignity, and

and were not to be obey'd, &c. His Tenets were here defined againſt, and he himſelfe anathematized.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 1200.

AGnes Romana, *Noribertus*, *Malachias*, *Bernardus Abbas*, *Gulielmus Dux Aquitaniæ*, *Gerardus*, *Hildigardis*, *Thomas Cantuarienſis*, *Hugo Lincolnienſis* and others.

Nations converted.

The *Pomeranians* and *Norvegians* converted by one *Nicholas* a Monk, who was afterwards Pope, and called *Nicolus* the third.

From the year of Chriſt 1200.

Chief Paſtors.

1216 *Gelaſius* 2.
1222 *Gregorius* 9.
1241 *Celeſtius* 4.
1242 *Innocentius* 4.
1254 *Alexander* 4.
1261 *Urbanus* 4.
1265 *Clemens* 4.
1271 *Gregorius* 10.
Innocentius 5. } 1276
Adrianus 5. }
Joannes 20. }

General Councils.

The fourth *Lateran Councel* (Fathers 1285.) Pope *Innocent* the third preſiding. *Anno* 1215.

Authors, *Onuphrius*, *Platina*, *Genebrard*, and *Spondanus*.

1277 *Nicolaus* 3.
1281 *Martinus* 4.
1285 *Honorius* 4.
1288 *Nicolaus* 4.
1294 *Celeſtinus* 5.
1295 *Bonifacius* 8.

The Council of *Lions.* (Fathers 100.) *Pope Gregory* the 10. preſiding. *Anno* 1274. againſt the *Grecians.* Authors, *Gulielmus* de *Nangis, Onuphrius, Platina, Spondanus.*

The fourth *Lateran Council* defin'd in the profeſſion of faith, 1. *That all men at the Reſurrection ſhall receive according to their merits, whether good or evil.* 2. *That the univerſal Church of the faithful is one, out of which no man is ſaved.* 3. *That the true Body and Bloud of Chriſt is in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the forms of Bread and Wine, the Bread being tranſubſtantiated by the Divine Power into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood.* 4. *That no man can make this Sacrament but a Prieſt, rightly ordained by the Keyes of the Church, which Jeſus Chriſt himſelf gave to the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors.* 5. *That Baptiſm profits little ones, as well as thoſe, who are of riper years unto ſalvation.* Can. 1.

It condemned the Hereſie of *Abbas Ioachim*, who deny'd the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt to be one higheſt thing, eſſence, or nature, though three diſtinct perſons. *Can.* 2.

It condemned all ſuch for Heretiques, as erect themſelves againſt the faith by them expounded in the firſt Canon. *Can.* 3.

It defined, *That all the faithful ſhould at leaſt once a year confeſs their ſins to their own Pariſh-Prieſt, or*

to

to ſome other by his approbation, and that they ſhould receive the B. Euchariſt at Eaſter. Can. 21. extra de pœnitentia.

The council of Lions defined, That *the Holy Ghoſt proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but one, not by two ſpirations, but by one. This hitherto* (ſaith the council) *the holy Roman Church (the Mother and Miſtris of all Churches) hath preach'd and taught, This the unchangeable and true ſentence of the Orthodox Fathers, as well Greek as Latin holdeth.* Can. 6. de Sum. Trinitate & fide Catholica.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 1300.

S. *Dominick* and S. *Francis*, Inſtitutors of their holy Orders of Friers. *Maria Oguiaca, Chriſtina Mirabilis, Engelbertus Colonienſis, Petrus Mediolanenſis, Luitgardis, Elizabeth Lantgranenſis, Anthonius Paduenſus, Gulielmus Bononienſis, Hyacinthus, Alexander de Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, Nicolaus Noveſienſis, Hedingis, Medardes, Nicolaus Tolentinas, Mechtildis, Gertrudis, Angela de fulgineo,* and many others.

Nations converted.

The Livonians converted by *Medardes*, the Lituanians by the Knights of S. *Mary*, the Emperour *Caſſanes*, with innumerable Tartarians, converted alſo in this Age.

From

From the year 1300.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
1303 *Benedictus* 9.	The Council of *Vienna*, (Fathers 300.) Pope *Clement* 5. presiding. *An. Dom.* 1311.
1305 *Clemens* 5.	
1316 *Ioannes* 21.	
1334 *Benedictus* 10.	Authors, *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, *Spondanus*.
1343 *Clement* 6.	
1352 *Innocentius* 6.	
1362 *Urbanus* 5.	
1371 *Gregorius* 11.	
1378 *Urbanus* 6.	
1389 *Bonifacius* 9.	

This Council defined *Baptism to be necessary as well for infants, as those of riper age. Habetur in Clementina, de Sum. Trinitate & Fide Catholica.*

It condemned the *Begardes* and *Beguines*, who held carnal lust done out of temptation to be no sin, and that we ought not to shew reverence at the elevation of the Body of Christ, &c. *Habetur in Clementina, ad nostrum de hæreticis.*

Catho-

Catholique Professors to the year 1400.

Ivo Jurisconsultus, *Rochus*, *Christina*, *Sumlensis* *Venturinus Bergomensis*, *Gertrudis de Eston*, *Godfridus Eptingensis*, *Henricus Supo*, *Catharina Senensis*, *Albertus Alobrogensis*, *Andreas Fesulanus*, *Gerardus Groet*, and many others.

Nations converted.

Azatines, Emperour of the Turks, the Isles of the *Canaries*, the revolted *Lituanians*, the *Cunians*, the *Bosnians*, the *Lipuensians*, the *Patrinians*, and the *Sclavonian* Nations converted by the means of Pope *Clement* the 6. and *Lewis* King of Hungary.

From the year of Christ 1400.

Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
1404 *Innocentius* 7.	The Council of *Constance An.* 1415. against *John Wickliff*, *John Husse*, and *Hierome of Prague*, *Pope John* 22. and *Martin* the 5. presiding.
1406 *Gregorius* 12.	
1409 *Alexander* 5.	
14010 *Joannes* 22.	
1417 *Martinus* 5.	
1430 *Eugenius* 4.	
1447 *Nicolaus* 5.	

D Felix 5th 1445
a rival Pope

1455 *Calixtus* 3.
1458 *Pius* 2.
1464 *Paulus* 2.
1471 *Sixtus* 4.
1484 *Innocentius* 8.
1492 *Alexander* 6.

The Council of *Florence* (Fathers 145.) Pope *Eugenius* 4. presiding. *An.* 1439. against many heresies.

Authors, *Palmerinus*, *Volateran*, *Platina*, *Spondanus*.

Pope Pius 3rd employed them

The Council of *Constance* defined against, and anathematiz'd *John Wickliffe*, *John Huss*, and *Hierom* of *Prague*, for teaching, 1. *That all Priests and Magistrates fall from their dignity by any mortal sin, and ought no longer to be obey'd.* 2. *That the Body and Blood of Christ are not really present in the Sacrament.* 3. *That God must obey the Devil.* 4. *That it is against Scripture for Priests to have any possessions.* 5. *That temporal Lords might take away Church-livings at their pleasure.* 6. *That all things happened by inevitable necessity, &c.* Sess. 8.

It defined, *That Communion under one kind was sufficient to salvation*; and *Heresie*, to say, *that a tyrant Prince might lawfully be kill'd by his own subjects.* Sess. 13.

The Council of *Florence* defined, *That the souls of such as die in state of grace, not having fully satisfied for their sins by worthy fruits of penance, are purg'd with purging pains.* And, *That the holy Apostolique See and Roman Bishop hath a primacy over all the world, and is the Successor of S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Head of the whole Church.* In decret. Eugenii Pap. 4.

In 1456 Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini (was after Pius 2nd) was created Cardinal — It

It defined, *That by the force of the words of Conſecration, the ſubſtance of the Bread is chang'd into the Body of Chriſt, and the ſubſtance of the Wine into his Bloud, and that whole Chriſt is under either kind, and every particle of either kind, if divided.*

It defined, *the Books of the Machabees, &c. Canonical.* In decret. Unionis.

The *Grecians*, *Jacobites*, *Armenians*, and Patriarch of Conſtantinople ſubſcribed this Counſil, and were reunited to the Church of Rome.

Catholique Profeſſors to the year 1500.

Colecta, Vincentius, Valentinus, Bernardinus Senenſis, Joannes Capiſtranus, Laurentius, Juſtinianus, Anthonius Florentinus, Didacus ab Aſcala, Andreas Chius, Maria Toletana, Dominicus Piſcienſis, Margarita Ravennatenſis, Nicolaus Eremita, Jacobus Picenus, Jacobus Alemannus, Columba, Oſanna Mantuana, and many others.

Nations converted.

The *Gamogeſians*, the people of the Kingdoms of *Betonine, Guinea, Angola*, and *Congo* converted in this age.

From the year of Christ 1500.

	Chief Pastors.	General Councils.
1503	*Pius* 3: *Julius* 2.	The last Lateran Council, Pope *Julius* 2. and *Leo* 10. presiding. *An. Dom.* 1512. I find not the certain number of the Fathers; it was a General Council.
1513	*Leo* 10.	
1522	*Adrianus* 6.	
1523	*Clement* 7.	
1534	*Paulus* 3.	
1550	*Julius* 3.	
1555	*Marcellus* 2. *Paulus* 4.	
1560	*Pius* 4.	The Council of *Trent*, Pope *Paul* the 3. and *Pius* 4. presiding against *Martin Luther*, and his fellow-Protestants. *An.* 1546.
1566	*Pius* 5.	
1572	*Gregorius* 13.	
1585	*Sixtus* 5.	
1590	*Urbanus* 7. *Gregorius* 14.	
1591	*Innocentius* 9.	
1592	*Clement* 8.	
1605	*Leo* 11. *Paul* 5.	
1620	*Gregorius* 15.	
1623	*Urbanus* 8.	
1645	*Innocentius* 10. now living 1654.	

The

The last Lateran Council defined, *The soul of man immortal, and that there be as many humane souls as bodies, anathematizing all such as obstinately defend or hold the contrary.* Sess. 8.

What the definitions of the Council of *Trent* are I shall not need to relate, they are conformable to those of all precedent General Councils, for us, and against Sectaries, as our adversaries wel know, and cannot deny.

Catholike Professors to the year 1600.

Catharina Genovensis, Franciscus à Paula, Andreas ex Olivo, Franciscus Zimondus, Gentilis Ravennatensis, Ignatius Loiola, Franciscus Zaverius, Felix Capucinus, Carolus Borromeus, Antonius Pestana, Edmundus Campianus, Philippus Nereus, Cæsar Baronius, Gulielmus Alanus, &c.

Nations converted.

Great multitudes were converted in this Age, both in *Italy, France, Spain, Germany, Polonia, India, Iaponia, China,* by Priests, and Religious of the Roman Church: and likewise some considerable persons of the English Nation, even in the heat of persecution.

I have omitted multitudes of Provincial Councils, all establishing and defining our Tenets over the whole world, a sure eviction of the consent

of Nations, as well as Ages, in our behalfe.

Now let any rational and diſintereſſed man be judg, whether the Fathers of theſe foreſaid councils were true Proteſtants or Roman Catholiques, (that is, whether they have taught and defined, Proteſtant, or Roman Catholique Doctrines) and doubtleſs, he will ſay, *Roman Catholiques*: And ſo by conſequence were all the Ages and Countryes which have received, and approved them for Orthodox, by humbly ſubmitting to their Decrees, to wit, all Ages, ſince Chriſts time: Therefore let no Proteſtant, or other Sectary delude himſelf, and his ignorant and credulous followers, with a pretence to Councils, ſeeing there is no one to be found for them (ſpeaking of General and œcumenical Councils) which ha's defined, or taught their Negative Doctrines, but all have more or leſs condemned them, according to the Hereſies then emergent. So impoſſible a task it is for them, to make a Catalogue of their Chief Paſtors and Councils in all Ages, which notwithſtanding muſt, and will be alwayes required of them, to the eternal confuſion of their novelties.

Fathers for the Churches continued Succeſſion.

IN the ſecond Age *Irenæus*. *Where is it then, that a man ſhall find ſuch Paſtors as S.* Paul *teacheth us, when he ſays, God hath placed in his Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondly Prophets, thirdly Doctors, &c. There then, where*

where the gifts of our Lord are placed, must we ſeek for the truth, amongſt whom the Succeſſion of the Church from the Apoſtles, and the purity of Doctrine is maintained in its integrity. lib. 4. ca. 45.

In the third Age *Tertullian. What the Apoſtles taught, I will preſcribe ought no otherwiſe to be learned, then by thoſe Churches which the Apoſtles founded.* lib. *præſcrip.* c. 21. And again, *What I believe, I received from the preſent Church, the preſent Church from the Primitive, that from the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles from Chriſt,* c. 37.

In the ſame Age *Origen. In our underſtanding Scripture, we muſt not depart from the firſt Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, nor believe otherwiſe, then as the Church of God hath by Succeſſion delivered to us.* In his 27. Treatiſe on the 23. of S. *Mat.*

In the ſame Age S. *Cyprian. How can he be acknowledged for a true Paſtor, who without ſucceeding to any one, begins from himſelf,* Ep. to *Magnus.*

In the fourth age S. *Athanaſius. Behold we have proved the Succeſſion of our Doctrine, delivered by hand to hand, from Father to Son, but as for you* (Arians) *new Jews, and children of* Caiphas, *what Progenitors can you ſhew for your ſpeeches?* in the Decree of the Nicene Synod againſt the Arians.

In the ſame Age S. *Pacian. For my ſelf, holding my ſelf ſecure, upon the Succeſſion of the Church, and contenting my ſelf with the peace of the antient Congregation, I have not learn'd any ſtudies of diſcord.* Epiſt. 3.

In the fifth Age *Optatus Melevitanus*, reckons up the Bishops from S. *Peter* to *Siricius* then Pope, saying to the Donatists, *Shew the original of your Chair, you who challenge the holy Church to your selves.* lib. 2. con. Parm.

In the same S. *Augustine. The Succession of Priests, from the very Seat of* Peter *the Apostle, &c. in the present Bishoprick, holds me in the Church.* Cont. Fund. Ep. ca. 4. *Number the Priests* (sayes he) *even from the Seat of* S. Peter, *that is the Rock, which the Gates of hell overcome not.* And in another place, *If the Church shall not continue here on earth to the end of the world, to whom did our Lord say, Behold I am with you to the consummation of the world?* Lib 3. de bapt. cont. Don.

In the same Age *Vincentius Lyrinensis. Faith is that which thou hast received, not that which thou hast devised, a thing not of private usurpation, but of publique Tradition, whereof thou ought'st not be the Author, but conserver,* &c. in his admonition against Heresies ca. 27.

Objections against the Churches continued Succession solved.

Ob. *Elias complained that he was left alone, 3 King.* 19. therefore the Church then failed.

Answ. He spake figuratively, for God himselfe told him in the same chap. v. 18. that he had 7000. at that time in *Israel* (where he was) who had not

not bow'd their knees to *Baal*: and in the Kingdome of *Juda* there was then publique profession of the true Religion in Hierusalem. *Paralip.* 22. 14. 15. so that consequence is false.

Ob. The Arian Heresie infected the whole world. *Ergo, &c.*

Answ. You mistake, the fury of that lasted not full four years; viz. from the Council of *Ariminum*, to the death of *Constantius*, and that only in the Eastern Churches, the Western feeling little or nothing by it. S. *Augustine* answers the Donatists objecting the same, *That even the Canonical Scriptures have this custome, that the word seems to be addres'd to all, when it reaches home only to some few.* Epist. 48.

Ob. S. *Hierome* sayes, *The whole world groan'd and wondred to see it self become Arian* (in his book against *Luciferius.*)

Answ. If she wondred, she knew not when it was done; if she groaned, she approved it not being done; therefore the major part were still Catholique. Let S. *Hierome* answer for himself. *The Bishops* (saith he against *Luciferius*) *that did the fact at* Ariminum *were deluded*, (viz. by the new Creed there made, which might have born a good sense) *few defending the fact, & some lamenting it.* And S. *Augustine* tells us, that the Church then appeared in her most constant members, *Athanasius* and others. Epist. 48.

Ob. The Church will fail in the time of Antichrist,

christ, according to that, unless there come a revolt first, &c. 2 *Thes.* 23.

Answ. No, she will not; she shall then suffer great persecution, *Apoc.* 20. 8. and therefore shall be to suffer.

Many will revolt, all shall not.

Ob. What if men would not persever? how then? you hold free-will I hope?

Answ. With S. *Augustine* to the *Donatists*, as if the Holy Ghost were ignorant what would be the Free-will of men, which yet foreseeing, he foretold, *That the Church of Christ should endure for ever.* *De Unit. Eccles. ca.* 12.

ARTICLE II.

That Protestants have no continued Succession.

THE ARGUMENT.

1. THE true Church of God hath had a continued Succession from Christ to this time, and shall have from hence to the end of the world, as hath been proved.
2. But the Protestant Church (and so of all other Sectaries) hath not a continued Succession from Christ to this time.
3. Therefore the Protestant Church is not the true Church of God.

The *minor* (which only remains unproved) is cleared by the concession of our most learned adversaries, who freely and unanimously confess, That before *Luther* made his separation from the Church of *Rome*, for 900. or 1000. yeares together, the whole world was Catholique, and in obedience to the Pope of *Rome*, there being no Protestants any where to be found, or heard of.

Let

Let *therefore our very enemies be our Judges*, Deut. 32. v. 31.

John Calvin. *All the Western Churches have defended Papistry.* Respon. ad Versipell. p. 154.

Hospinian. *Luthers separation was from all the world.* Epist. 141.

White. *Popery was a Lepresie, breeding so universally in the Church, that there was no visible company of men appearing in the world free from it.* Defence c. 37. p. 136.

Bennet Norton. *The whole Christian world knows, that before* Luther, *all Churches were overwhelm'd with more then Cymerian darkness.* Treatise of the Church. p. 145.

Bancroft. *The Priests, and all the people too were drown'd in Popery.* Censure 4.

Jewel. *The whole world, Princes, Priests, and people, were overwhelmed with ignorance, and bound by oath to the Pope.* Sermon on Luke 11.

Chamierus. *Apostasie averted the whole Body from Christ.* Epist. 49.

Brochard. *When the first assault was made upon the Papacy by* Luther, *the knowledg of Christ was wanting in all, and every of his members.* On the 2. Rev. pa. 41.

Whitaker. *In times past no Religion but the Papistical had place in the Church.* Controversie 4. q. 5. c. 3.

Bucer. *All the world err'd in that Article of the Real Presence.* p 660.

Cal-

Calvin. *They made all the Kings and people of the earth drunk, from the first to the last.* Institu. l. 4. c. 18. par.

Perkins. *During the space of* 900. *years the Popish Heresie had spread it self over the whole world.* Exposit. Symb. p. 266.

Bale. *From* Phocas (*who lived* An. Dom. 602.) *till the renewing of the Gospel, the Doctrine of Christ was in lurking holes.* Centur. 1. p. 47. 65.

Simon Voyon. *When* Boniface *was installed, then was that universal Apostasie from the Faith, which was foretold by* Paul. Catalog. Doctor. Ep. to the Reader.

Bibliander. *It is without all question, that from the time of* Gregory the Great, *the Pope is Antichrist, who with his abhominations hath made drunk all Kings and people, from the highest to the lowest.* In orat. ad principes Germaniæ. c. 72. *Hospinian* hath the very same expression. *Hist. Sacrament. l.* 2.

A second Argument.

1. WIthout a continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks, succeeding one another in the profession of the same Faith, from Christ and his Apostles to this time, a continued Succession cannot be had.
2. But Protestants have no continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks succeeding one another, from Christ and his Apostles to this time,

time, in the profeſſion of the ſame Faith or Tenets, the 39. Articles, or any other ſet number of Tenets, expreſly holding and denying all the ſame points.

3. Therefore Proteſtants have no continued Succeſſion from Chriſt and his Apoſtles to this time.

The *major* is manifeſt, becauſe it proceeds from the definition to the thing defined.

The *minor* is proved, becauſe Proteſtants have never yet been able, nor ever will, to aſſign any ſuch number of men, whom they have ſucceeded in their 39. *Articles*, or *Luther* in his *Auguſtan Confeſſion*, when he revolted from the Catholique Church, no nor yet one ſingle Dioceſs, or Biſhop.

If any man pretend to ſuch a Catalogue, let him name none but only ſuch, as held explicitely the 39. *Articles*, all granting and denying the ſame points, that the late Proteſtants of England granted and deny'd, or that our new Reformers deny and grant; for if they differ from them in any one material point, they cannot be eſteemed Proteſtants. Let him not name the *Waldenſes*, for *they held the real preſence, that the Apoſtles were Laymen, that all Magiſtrates fall from their dignity by any mortal ſin, that it is not lawful to ſwear in any caſe, &c. Illiricus* in Catalog. Waldenſ. Confeſſ. Bohem. a. 1. and *Waldo*, an unlearned Merchant of Lions, lived but in the year 1160.

Let

Let him not name the *Huſſites*, for they held *Maſs, Tranſubſtantiation, and ſeven Sacraments with us.* See *Fox* in his Acts. proteſt. Apol. Tract. 2. c. 2. Sect. 4. 5. They held, *the univerſal Church conſiſted only of the predeſtinate, That all the works of the predeſtinate are vertues, and that they cannot fall from the Faith, they held all the errours of* John Wickliff, and were condemned with him in the Council of *Conſtance. Seſſ.* 6. 7. and 15.

Let him not name the *Albigenſes*; for they *held all marriages to be unlawful, and all things begotten ex coitu, to be unclean.* S. Bernard Homil. 66. in Cantica. *They held two Gods, a good and an evil, teaching, that the evil God made all viſible things, they rejected the Old Teſtament.* Rogerus Hoveden. ex actibus Toloſanis An. 1178. and Rainerus. c. 6.

Let him not name the *Cathariſtes* or Puritan Waldenſes, for they held, *that the Devil made the World, and deny'd the reſurrection.* Rainerus. c. 6. parag. 5. p. Secta Catharorum.

Let him not cite the *Wickleſians*, for they held, *That all things came to paſs by fatal neceſſity, that Princes and Magiſtrates fell from their dignity and power by mortal ſin.* Concil. Conſt. c. 8.

Let him not name the *Grecians*, for they *rejected the Communion of Proteſtants. Cenſur. Eccleſ. Orientalis.* They were at leaſt 700. or 800. years in the Communion of the Roman Church, as witneſs the firſt eight General Councils, all held in Greece, and approved by the Popes of Rome. The firſt revolt

volt was made by the Grecians, *denying the procession of the Holy Ghost from God the Son*, they were united again to the Church of Rome in the council of *Florence* Sess. last. *they held Transubstantiation, seven Sacraments, unbloudy Sacrifice, prayer to Saints, and for the dead. censur. Eccles. Orientalis. c.* 7. 10, 12, 13, 21.

Let him not name the Egyptians, for they held *Transubstantiation, and unbloudy Sacrifice, as is manifest by their Liturgies, but deny'd the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; and held but one will in Christ.* Godingus. l. 1. c. 28. de rebus Abyssinorum.

Let him not cite the Armenians, for they hold *but one nature in Christ, and that his flesh was chang'd into the Divinity. Euthimius in his panop. part.* 2. *tit.* 20. they were condemned by the *Council of Calced. Act* 5.

Protestants pretence to the Fathers of the first 500. years is very idle, because were it true, as it is most false, that those Fathers were Protestants, yet could not that suffice, to prove them a continued Succession of 1600. years.

Secondly, because those of the sixth Age must needs know better what was the Religions and Tenets of them, who lived in the fifth Age, by whom they were instructed, and with whom they daily convers'd, then our Protestants can now do, who have protested on their salvation, that it was the very same with theirs, receiv'd from them by word

word of mouth, and ſo from age to age: and finally becauſe:

A third Argument.

1. If our Tenets in which we differ from Proteſtants, and are oppoſed by them, be taught and approved by the Fathers of the firſt 500. years, then it is wholly impoſſible they ſhould be for Proteſtants, and againſt us.
2. But our Doctrines (in which we differ from Proteſtants, and are oppoſed by them) are taught & approved by the Fathers of the firſt 500. years.
3. Therefore it is wholly impoſſible the Fathers of the firſt 500. years ſhould be for them, and againſt us.

The *major* is manifeſt of it ſelf, the *minor* is proved; firſt, by what has been already cited out of thoſe Fathers, as alſo by what ſhall be cited out of them in my enſuing arguments. Secondly, by the ingenuous confeſſion of our Adverſaries.

Fulk; *I confeſs*, Hierome, Auſtin, Ambroſe, *&c. held the Invocation of Saints*, Riot. Briſton. p. 36.

Kemnitius. *Moſt of the Fathers did not diſpute, but avouch, that the ſouls of Martyrs heard the Petitions of thoſe who pray'd to them; They went to the Monuments of Martyrs, and invocated Martyrs by name.* Examin. Concil. Trident. par. 3. p. 200.

Whitguift; *All the Biſhops and learned Writers of the Greek and Latin Church too, for the moſt part, were ſpotted with the Doctrines of Free will, Merit, Invocation of Saints*, in his defence p. 473.

Calvin; *It was a custome* 1300. *years ago to pray for the dead, but all of that time, I confess, were carried away into errour.* Institut. b. 3. c. 5. parag. 10.

Whitaker; *It is true, which* Calvin *and the Centuriists have written, That the Antient Church did erre in many things, as touching Lymbo, Free-will, Merit of works, &c.* contro. 2. q. 5. c. 7.

Peter Martyr; *As long as we stand to the Councils and Fathers, we shall remain alwayes in the same errours.* De voto. colum. 1559.

Duditius; *If that be true which the Fathers have profess'd with mutual consent, it is altogether on the Papists sides;* Apud Bezam Epist. 1.

Raynolds; *If all the Fathers held a point now in question, and not only held it, but also taught, not darkly, but plainly, &c. this consent of theirs were unsecure;* Confess. c. 5. divis. 1.

Jewel; *The way of finding truth by God speaking in the Church and Councils is very uncertain, and in a manner fanatical.* Apolog. part. 4. p. 117.

Therefore the Fathers of the first five hundred years are not for Protestants, but for us; therefore Protestants are utterly at a loss in the point of a continued Succession.

Objections solved.

Ob. IN all the ages before *Luther*, Protestants had a Church, though it were invisible.

Answ. This is a meer Midsummer-nights dream, that

that a Church (which is a Congregation of visible men preaching, baptizing, and converting Nations) should be extant for a 1000. years, and yet be all this while invisible, neither to be seen nor heard of in the world.

Ob. The Church in communion with the Sea of *Rome* was the true Church, till she Apostatiz'd and fell from the Faith.

Answ. If she were once the true Church, she is and shall be so for ever; she cannot fail, as hath been proved, nor erre in faith, as shall be proved hereafter.

Ob. The Catholique Succession was our Succession for the first five centuries.

Answ. You may as well tell me of a white Blackmoore; a Catholique is not a Protestant, nor a Catholique Succession a Protestant Succession. Who ever heard of a *Protestant Pope?* the *Catholique Church* was alwayes govern'd by a *Pope* in the first five centuries, as now it is, and hath defined our Tenets, and condemn'd yours, as you have seen. It is the very essence of a *Protestant* (as a *Protestant*) to *protest* against the Catholike Church, as *Lutherans* and you have done.

Ob. We protest only against her errours.

Answ. Yes against manifest revealed Verities, (as hath and shall be proved) and the very fundamentals of our Faith.

Ob. S. *Augustine*, S. *Hierome*, and many others, are divided in their opinions, whether *Linus* or

Clement immediately succeeded S. *Peter*.

Answ. Be it so, yet they all agreed in this, that the Succession was morally continued, to which it is a thing indifferent, whether *Clement* immediately succeeded him, as he well might, being his Scholar, or first *Linus*, then *Cletus*, and then *Clement*, which is now the more common opinion of the Church.

ARTICLE

Article III.

The Catholique Churches visibility asserted.

OUr Tenet is, *That the holy Catholique and Apostolique Church of God, hath had not only a continued, but also a visible Succession from Christ to this time, &c.* which we prove thus.

1. A society of men, which hath alwayes in it exteriour consecration and Ordination of Ministers, preaching, baptizing and administring Sacraments, must of necessity be alwayes visible.
2. But the Church of Christ is a society of men, which hath alwayes in it exteriour consecration and ordination of Ministers, preaching, baptizing, and administring Sacraments.
3. Therefore the Church of Christ must of necessity be alwayes visible.

The *major* is proved by evident reason, because those are all outward and sensible actions, which are inconsistent with an invisible society of actors.

The *minor* is proved by *Scripture*, *Go ye teaching all Nations, baptizing them &c.* And, *behold I am with you all dayes; &c.* S. Mat. 28. v. 20. *He gave some*

Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors, and Doctors to the conſummation of the Saints, Epheſ. 4. 11, 12.

A ſecond Argument.

1. A light alwayes ſhining to the world, and a City ſo ſeated on a hill, that it cannot be hid, muſt needs be alwayes viſible.
2. But the Church of Chriſt is a light alwayes ſhineing to the world, and a City ſo ſeated on a hill, that it cannot be hid.
3. Therefore the Church of Chriſt muſt needs be alwayes viſible.

The *major* is manifeſt by the very termes.

The *minor* is proved by Scripture; *The mountain of the Houſe of our Lord ſhall be prepared on the top of mountains,* Iſa. 2. 2. *You are the light of the world, a City ſeated on a hill cannot be hid,* S. Matth. 5. 14. *He hath put his Tabernacle, his Church, in the Sun,* Pſal. 18. 4.

Fathers for the Churches viſibility.

IN the ſecond Age Irenæus; *Where is it then, that a man ſhall find ſuch Paſtors, as S.* Paul *tells us of, when he ſayes, God hath placed in his Church firſt Apoſtles, &c.* 4. Epheſ. l. 4. c. 45.

In the third Age Origen; *The Church is full of brightneſs, even from Eaſt to Weſt.* Homil. 3. on S. Mat.

In

In the ſame Age S. Cyprian; *The Church being cloathed with the light of our Lord, ſpreads its beames through the whole world.* De unit. Eccleſ.

In the fourth Age S. Chryſoſtome, *It is eaſier, that the Sun ſhould be extinguiſhed, then that the Church ſhould be obſcured.* Homil. 4. on Iſay 6.

In the fifth Age S. Auguſtine, *The Church is ſeated on a mountain, and cannot be hid, &c. they are blind that ſee not ſo great a mountain, that ſhut their eyes againſt a light ſet on a Candleſtick.* Lib. 3. con: *Parmenian.* And again, *The Church hath this moſt certain mark, that ſhe cannot be hid.* con. Petilian. c. 104.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. THe Church is believed, therefore not ſeen.

Anſw. She is believed in the ſenſe of her Doctrines, and to be guided to all truth by the Holy Ghoſt, but ſeen in her Paſtors outward Government and preaching; wherefore I deny the conſequence.

Ob. The *Woman* (the Church) *fled into the Wilderneſs*, Apoc. 12. 6.

Anſw. But is followed, and perſecuted by the Dragon, v. 17. therefore viſible.

Ob. The Church of the predeſtinate is inviſible.

Anſw. There is no ſuch thing as a Church of the

predeſtinate, Chriſts Church is the Congregation of all true Believers, as well reprobate as predeſtinate: *There is in his floore both wheat and chaffe*, S.Mat. c.3. and *in his field both corn and tares, which ſhall grow together till the harveſt* (the day of Judgment) S.Mat. c.13. The predeſtinate are as viſible as the reprobate; 'tis true indeed, their predeſtination is inviſible, and ſo is alſo theſe mens reprobation.

ARTICLE IV.

The true Church demonſtrated by her Unity and Univerſality.

UNity being eſſentially preſuppos'd to *Univerſality*, I thought it not improper to joyne theſe two in one Article. Now that the church of *Rome* is both perfectly one, and alſo *univerſal* for time and place, is thus demonſtrated.

The Argument for Unity.

1. The *Church* of *Chriſt* is one body, one fold, or ſloek (of which he himſelf is the ſupreme inviſible head, and the Pope his Deputy on earth the viſible, or miniſterial.)
2. But the Roman Catholique Church, and no other, is this one body, one fold, or flock.
3. Therefore the Roman Catholique Church, and no other, is the Church of *Chriſt*.

The *major* is proved, *We are one bread one body, as many as participate of one bread*, 1 Cor. 10. 18. *He hath made him* (Chriſt) *Head over all the Church, which is his body*, Epheſ. 1. 22, 23. *There ſhall be made one fold, and one Paſtor*, Joh. 10. 16. *I beſeech you that you all ſpeak one thing, and that there be no Schiſmes among you*,

you, but that you be perfect in one sense, and one judgment, 1 Cor. 1: 10. *The multitude of believers had one heart, one soul*, Acts 4. 32. *Christ pray'd, that his Disciples might be one*, S. Joh. 17. 11. *I believe one holy Catholique and Apostolique Church.* The Nicene Creed.

The *minor* is made evident (even to the weakest understanding) by the present manifold Schismes and divisions, which are now among *Protestants*, and all other Sectaries, as well in Doctrine as Government, whereas *Catholiques* are perfectly *one*, both in Discipline and Doctrine, all the world over, even to the least Article or point of Faith, being all united to one supreme invisible Head, *Christ Jesus*, and all subordinate to one visible and ministerial Head, the *Pope*, his Vicar on earth. We all resolve our selves in points of Faith into one safe and most unchangeable principle, *I believe the holy Catholique Church*; we look on her, as the immediate and authoriz'd proponent of all revealed Verities, and the infallible Judg of controversies; God himself being the prime Author, and his authority the formal motive, and object of our Faith. ¶ Remember the fowl Squabbles in both Doct. & Discipline between the Jansenists & Jesuits Franciscans & Dominicans: & then wheres is ye Roman Unity?

A second Argument for its Unity.

1. AS a natural unity and conversion of the parts among themselves, and to the Head, is necessary for the being and conservation of

a

a natural body: So the ſpiritual unity and connexion of the members amongſt themſelves, and to the Head, is neceſſary for the being and conſervation of a myſtical body.

2. But the Church of Chriſt (as I have proved) is a myſtical Body.

3. Therefore a ſpiritual unity and connexion of the members amongſt themſelves, and to the Head, is neceſſary for the being and conſervation of the Church of Chriſt.

The *major* is proved by the purity of reaſon, which is between a natural and myſtical body; for as a natural body muſt needs die, if all its parts, by which it ſhould ſubſiſt, be torn and divided from one another; ſo alſo a myſtical body periſhes, if all its members be divided from one another, and from the head (whence it hath its ſpiritual life and motion) by Schiſme and Hereſie.

The Argument for Univerſality.

1. TO be univerſal for time and place, is nothing els, but to be coexiſtent with all time, and to be ſpread or diffus'd over all places.

2. But the Church of Chriſt, from the time he founded it, hath been coexiſtent with all time, and ſhall be to the worlds end, and hath, and ſhall be ſpread over all Nations.

3. Therefore the Church of Chriſt is univerſal (or Ca-

Catholique) for time and place.

The *major* is proved, because the definition, and the thing defined are convertible.

The *minor* is proved by Scripture, for time thus, *Go ye, &c.* and *behold I am with you all dayes, even to the consummation of the world*, S. Mat. 28. 20. *He gave some Apostles, &c. to the consummation of the Saints*, Ephes. 4. 12, 13. *The Paraclete shall abide with you for ever*, S. John 14. 15, 16. *He* (Christ) *shall raign in the House of* Jacob *for ever, and of his Kingdome there shall be no end*, S. Lu. 1. 33.

For place thus; *All Nations whatsoever thou hast made shall come and adore before thee O Lord*, Psal. 85. 9. *All Nations shall flow unto it*, Isa. 2. 2. *Go ye teaching all Nations, &c.* S. Mat. 28. 20. *Their sound went out over all the earth, &c.*

I resume the Argument, and make it thus.

1. That Church which is not universal (or Catholique) for time and place, is not the Church of Christ.
2. But the Protestant Church (and the like may be said of all other Sectaries) is not universal (or Catholique) for time and place.
3. Therefore the Protestant Church is not the Church of Christ.

The *major* hath been proved before.

The *minor* is proved, because before *Luther*, (who lived little above sixscore years ago) there were no Protestants to be found in the whole world, as hath been proved by us, and confess'd by our adversaries.

Though not by that name, yet in Deed: were from Christ & his Apost: times to Luther & our Times.

versaries. To which you may add, they have never yet been able to convert any one Nation from Infidelity to the Faith of Christ, nor ever had communion with all Nations, nor indeed any perfect communion among themselves; therefore they cannot be the Catholique Church.

Fathers for Unity and Universality.

IN the second Age Irenæus; *We must obey those Priests that are in the Church, those that have a succession from the Apostles, &c. and all the rest who have departed from the original Succession (where ever they be assembled) to have suspected as Heretikes, or Schismatikes, and all these fall from the truth*, l. 4. c. 43.

In the third Age Origen; *Let the Doctrine of the Church be kept, which is delivered from the Apostles by order of Succession, and remains in the Church to this very day.* præfat. in lib. periarchon.

In the fourth Age Lactantius; *It is only the Catholique* (or universal) *Church, that hath the true worship and service of God, &c. from which whoever departs hath no hope of life*, l. 1. c. ult.

In the same Age S. *Cyril* of Hierusalem, *The Church is called Catholique* (or universal) *because it is spread over all the world from one end to the other.* Cataches. 18.

In the fifth Age S. Austin; *We must hold the communion of that Church, which is called Catholique*

lique, both by her own and ſtrangers, l. de vera relig. And again, *Whoever is divided from the Catholique Church, how laudable ſoever he ſeemes to himſelf to live, &c. he ſhall be excluded from life.* Epiſt. 152.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. THe *Roman Catholique Church* is a particular Church, therefore it is not Catholique or Univerſal.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh your antecedent, the *Roman Church*, as taken only for the congregation of *Rome*, or Italy, is a particular church, I grant, as taken for the whole collection of churches, holding communion with the Sea of *Rome*, I deny it. For ſo it is an univerſal church, containing all particular churches, as all the parts are contained in the whole, and in this acception alſo it is call'd the *Roman Church*, becauſe the particular Roman Church is the Mother Church, and hath a power of Headſhip and Juriſdiction over all the reſt.

Ob. How can a church of one denomination be univerſal?

Anſw. I have told you already, by the extent and latitude of her power, which is over all. So a particular man is call'd a *General*, by reaſon of his power over all the *Army*.

Ob. You communicate not with us, and many others;

others; therefore your communion is not Catholique or Universal.

Answ. I grant the antecedent, but deny the consequence, for universal communion requires not communion with all particular Sects or persons, but only with all true Believers, no, *A man that is an Heretique, after the first and second admonition avoid*, Titus 3. 10, 11.

ARTICLE V.

The Churches Infallibility demonstrated.

OUr Tenet is, That *the Roman Catholike Church is the highest visible Judg of controversies, and that she is infallible, both in her propositions, and definitions of all points of Faith; having a power from God to oblige all men to believe her, under pain of damnation*; proved thus.

The first Argument for her infallibility.

1. No man by hearing (or believing) Christ, can hear an errour in Faith.
2. But every man by hearing the Roman church heares Christ.
3. Therefore no man by hearing the Roman Church can hear an errour in Faith, therefore she is infallible.

The *major* must be granted, otherwise you charge Christ to be the Author of damning lyes.

The minor is proved; *He that heareth you* (the Church) *heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth* Apostolick not Roman.

ſeth me, S. Luk. 10. 16. The conſequences are both unavoidable.

A ſecond Argument for her Infallibility.

1. NO man can be damned for not believing an errour in faith.
2. But every man ſhall be damned for not believing the Church. not Romane, but Catholique.
3. Therefore no man can believe an error in faith by believing the Church.

The *major* is proved, becauſe otherwiſe God were a tyrant, in damning us for not believing a lye, which contradicts himſelf.

The *minor* is as evident; *He that will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as an Heathen and a Publican*, S. Mat. 18. 18. *He that knoweth God, heareth us, and he that heareth us not, is not of God; in this we know the ſpirit of truth, and the ſpirit of error*, 1 John 4. 6. *Go ye preaching the Goſpel to all creatures, &c. He that believeth not ſhall be condemned*, S. Mark 16. 16.

A third Argument for her Infallibility.

1. IF Chriſt be alwayes with his Church, and have made her the pillar and firmament of truth, againſt which the gates of hell (Hereſies) ſhall not prevail, and given her the Holy Ghoſt to aſſiſt her to all truth, ſo that her definitions in an approved General council are the very dictates of the Holy Ghoſt; then is it impoſ-

ſible the church ſhould erre in Faith.

2. But all this Chriſt hath done for his church.

3. Therefore it is impoſſible the church ſhould erre in Faith. what is all this to ye infallibility of ye Romans

The ſequel of the *major* is manifeſt by the very terms of the ſuppoſition.

The *minor* is proved; *Go ye teaching all Nations, &c.* and *behold I am with you all daies,* (he is with her teaching) S. Mat. 28. 20. *The houſe of God, which is the pillar and firmament of truth,* 1 Tim. 3. 15. *The gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it,* S. Mat. 16. 18. *He will give you another Paraclete that he may abide with you for ever, &c. He ſhall teach you all things, and ſuggeſt to you all things whatſoever I ſhall ſay to you* (all points of Faith) S. John 14. 26. *He ſhall teach you all truth* (no errours) S. Joh. 16. 13. *It hath ſeemed good* (ſay the Apoſtles in council) *to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us,* Acts 15. 28.

The conſequence is confirmed, becauſe were not the church infallible in things of faith, we could have no infallible aſſurance at this diſtance, What were the Word of God, what not; or what the true ſenſe and meaning is of any one book, or chapter in the whole Bible, nor conſequently of our ſalvation, ſince *without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, Heb.* 11. 6.

The fourth and laſt Argument for her Infallibility.

1. THe church hath a power from God, to oblige all men under pain of damnation to be-

believe her in her Propoſals and definitions of Faith.

2. But ſhe could not have ſuch a power from God, unleſs ſhe were infallible in her Propoſals and definitions of Faith.

3. Therefore ſhe is infallible in her Propoſals and definitions of Faith.

The *major* is proved by all thoſe texts above-cited, in the firſt and ſecond argument, as alſo by the councils of all ages, which command all men under pain of damnation to believe and ſubſcribe to her Decrees and definitions of faith, which hath accordingly been done, both by the Fathers, and all true believers.

The *minor* is proved by reaſon, becauſe it were not conſiſtent with the juſtice, mercy, or veracity of God, to give a fallible and erring Judg ſuch a power in things of that high conſequence.

An Argument for the Churches Supreme power of Judicature.

1. THat is the ſupreme Judg in every cauſe, who hath an abſolute power to oblige all diſſenters to an agreement, and from whom there can be no appeal in ſuch a cauſe.

2. But the Catholique Church hath an abſolute power to oblige all that diſagree in controverted points of Faith, nor is there any appeal from her deciſion.

3. Therefore the Catholique Church is ſupreme

Judg in controverted points of faith.

The *major* is manifeſt by induction in all Courts of Judicature; the *minor* hath been proved above, by the firſt, ſecond, and fourth arguments.

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond age Irenæus, *Where the Church is, there is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of God is, there is all grace*, l. 3. c. 40. And again, *We muſt believe thoſe Prieſts that are in the Church, thoſe that have a ſucceſſion from the Apoſtles, who together with Epiſcopal power, have according to the good pleaſure of the Father received the certain gift of truth*, l. 1. c. 49. and 62. *The Church ſhall be under no mans judgment, for to the church all things are known, in which is perfect Faith of the Father, and of all the diſpenſation of Chriſt, and firm knowledg of the Holy Ghoſt, who teacheth all truth.*

In the third age Origen, *That only is to be believed for truth, which in nothing diſagrees from the tradition of the church.* And *in our underſtanding Scripture, &c. we muſt not believe otherwiſe, then as the church of God hath by ſucceſſion delivered to us.* Præfat. in lib. Periarch.

In the ſame age S. Cyprian, *The Spouſe of Chriſt cannot be defiled with adultery, ſhe is pure and chaſt*, De unitat. Eccleſ. And a little after, *Whoever divides from the Church, and cleaves to the adultereſſe, is ſeparated from the promiſes of the church: he cannot have God his Father, that hath not the Church his Mother.*

ther. And again, *To* Peters *Chair, and the principal church, infidelity or falſe faith cannot have acceſs*, Epiſt. 55.

In the fourth age Lactantius Firmianus: *It is only the Catholique Church that hath the true worſhip of God, this is the well-ſpring of truth, the dwelling place of faith, &c.* l. 3. c. ult.

In the ſame age S. *Cyril* of Hieruſalem: *The Roman Faith commanded by the Apoſtles cannot be changed*, l. 3. c. 4. in apolog. cont. Ruffin.

In the fifth age Vincentius Lyrinenſis: *All thoſe that will not be accounted Heretiques, muſt conforme themſelves to the decrees of œcumenical councils*, l. adverſ. hæreſ. c. 41.

In the ſame age S. Auguſtine: *I know by divine revelations, that the Spirit of truth teacheth it* (the church) *all truth*, l. 4. de Baptiſm c. 4. And again, *To diſpute againſt the whole church is moſt inſolent madneſs.* And *I my ſelf would not believe the Goſpel, were it not that the authority of the church moves me to it*, cont. Epiſt. fundam. c. 5.

I now reſume the principal argument, and retort it thus upon our adverſaries.

1. The Catholique church is infallible in her propoſals and definitions of faith.
2. But the Proteſtant church (and the like of all other Sectaries) is not infallible in her propoſals or definitions of faith.
3. Therefore the Proteſtant church is not the Catholique church.

The *major* hath been fully proved before: The *minor* muſt be granted by our adverſaries, becauſe they have no other way to excuſe themſelves from being Heretiques in their revolt from our church, but by falſly pretending the whole church err'd in faith, and taught idolatry and ſuperſtition for 900. or a 1000. years together, till they began their bleſſed reformation: a moſt blaſphemous evaſion (as hath been proved before) by which they have excluded themſelves from all poſſible aſſurance of true faith or ſalvation; and therefore to arrogate infallibility to themſelves, which they deny to the whole church, were a moſt frontleſſe impudence.

Note here for your better underſtanding this whole queſtion, that when we affirm the church is infallible in things of faith, by the word (*Church*) we underſtand not only the church diffus'd over all the world, unanimouſly teaching, whoſe doctrines of faith we hold to be infallible, but alſo the *church* repreſented in a council perfectly œcumenical (that is to ſay, call'd out of the whole world, and approved by the Pope) whoſe definitions of faith we hold to be infallible.

Objections from Scripture and Reaſon ſolved.

Ob. ALl the Iſraelites adored the golden calf, therefore the whole church err'd.

Anſw. Moſes and the *Levites* did not, who were many thouſands, *Exod.* 32. *Numb.* 3. 39. there-

therefore both thoſe Propoſitions are falſe.

Ob. The Jews council err'd in condemning Chriſt.

Anſw. No wonder it was not perfectly œcumenical, for Chriſt himſelf was then Head of the church on earth, and the higheſt authority was in him, not in the Jews council; and if the Jews church could erre, it doth not follow that the church of Chriſt can; *for it was built* (as S. *Paul* ſayes) *on better promiſes.*

Ob. S. *Peter* err'd in faith, when S. *Paul* contradicted him to the face.

Anſw. No, it was only in a matter of fact or converſation, according to *Tertullian*, *l. præſcrip. c.* 23. by withdrawing himſelf, and refuſing to eat vvith the Gentiles for fear of the Jews, *Gal.* 2. 12.

Ob. Chriſt blamed the incredulity of his Diſciples in not believing his Reſurrection, S. *Mark* 16. 14.

Anſw. He only blamed their ſlowneſs in believing it, not any error in faith, or loſs of faith in them, ſeeing they had it not before, for they underſtood not what Chriſt had ſaid to them of it, as appears S. *Lu.* 18. and S. *John* 20. they did not know all points of faith at once, but by degrees.

Ob. Every man is a lyar.

Anſw. In his own particular be it ſo, yet the Holy Ghoſt can and will teach the church all

truth, he is no friend to truth that contradicts it: and albeit man of himself may erre, yet by the Holy Ghost he may be guided so, that he erre not.

Ob. Try all things, hold fast that which is good, 1 Thes. 5. *Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, if they be from God,* 1 Joh. 4.

Answ. Try them by the churches authority and Apostolical tradition, that is the touchstone, not the dead letter, humane reason, or the private Spirit.

Ob. The church may erre, at least in points which are not fundamental.

Answ. All that God hath revealed is fundamental, at least for the formal motive of belief, to wit, the divine authority revealing (though not alwayes for the matter) and if it be once sufficiently propos'd to us by the church, as so revealed, we are then bound to believe it; so that their distinction of fundamentals and not fundamentals, is idle: Besides, if the church be infallible in fundamentals, then Protestants are Schismatiques at least, in revolting from her for points not fundamental, or necessary to salvation, and sin against charity, by accusing us of idolatry.

Ob. Those things only are fundamental which are absolutely necessary to salvation, and every man is bound explicitely to know and believe.

Answ.

Answ. If this were true, the Bible, or written Word (which you will have to be the only rule of faith aud Judg of controverfies) were not a fundamental; for faith depends not eſſentially on writing, but on hearing: Many were good Chriſtians and ſaved, before any of the new Scripture was written, or received among them, the firſt Goſpel not being written till ſeven or eight years after the death of Chriſt.

Ob. In *Gregory* the Greats time the Diſcipline and Doctrine of the church was alter'd and corrupted.

Anſw. That cannot be, for from S. *Gregory* the Greats time to this day, even the leaſt ſubſtantial part of either hath not been loſt, or changed, as is viſible in all the councils, Liturgies, and conſtitutions of the church.

Ob. That which may happen to any one particular man or church, may happen to all: But it may happen to any one particular man or church to erre in faith, therefore to all.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh the firſt Propoſition, that which may happen to one, may happen to all, in a diviſive ſenſe I grant, in a collective I deny, and ſo granting the ſecond Propoſition, I deny the conſequence; for it proceeds from a divided to a compounded ſenſe, and is as equivocal as this: That which may happen to any one egg in the Pariſh, may happen to all; but

it

it may happen to any one egg in the Pariſh to go into your mouth at once, therefore it may happen to all the eggs in the Pariſh to go into your mouth at once.

Ob. The Apoſtles were not each of them to depend on the decrees of the church.

Anſw. True, the church was to depend on them, as on the firſt Maſters and Propoſers of faith, who had each of them a peculiar prerogative of divine aſſiſtance, and infallibility in matters of faith, yet were they each conſonant to other in all their doctrines of faith, and whatever was taught by any of them, was ſtedfaſtly believed by all.

Ob. The church hath now no new revelations, nor can ſhe make any new points of faith, therefore we are not bound to believe her definitions.

Anſw. I grant the antecedent, but deny the conſequence; for though ſhe can make no new points, yet ſhe can explicate the old, and render that clear, which was before obſcure, and can define againſt new Hereſies.

Ob. The ſpiritual man judgeth all things, 1 *Cor.* 2. 15.

Anſw. By the rule of Apoſtolical Tradition, I grant, by humane reaſon or the private ſpirit I deny, and ſuch a ſpiritual man is in the church, as a part in the whole, not out of it, with Sectaries.

Ob.

Ob. Right reaſon is the only Judg of controverſies, therfore every mans private reaſon muſt be Judg for himſelf.

Anſw. The antecedent I have already ſufficiently refuted, and I alſo deny the conſequence, as the moſt groſs and unreaſonable aſſertion of all others, (though Mr. *Chillingworth's* chiefe ground) which appears thus;

Firſt, as contradicting the Word of God, wherein we are taught, *That the things which are of God, no man knows but the Spirit of God*, 1 Cor. 2. 11. *No man can ſay our Lord Jeſus* (with true faith) *but in the Holy Ghoſt*, 1 Cor. 12. 3. *By grace we are ſaved through faith, and that not of our ſelves, for it is the gift of God*, Epheſ. 2. 8. *We are not ſufficient to think any good thing our ſelves, as of our ſelves, but our ſufficiency is from God*, 2 Cor. 3. 5. We muſt captivate our underſtanding to the obedience of faith.

Secondly, becauſe divine revelations are not to be admitted, or rejected, for their ſeeming conſonancy or repugnance to every mans private reaſon; but for the authority of the church propoſing, as the immediate motive, and the authority of God revealing, as the higheſt motive of our faith, into which it is ultimately reſolved; nor can any thing be more rational, then to captivate and even renounce private reaſon, where God the Author of reaſon commands it.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, becauſe if every mans private reaſon is to judg for himſelf in matters of Religion, then all the Hereſies that ever yet were in the world, were good and ſound doctrines; for there was never any Sect of Heretiques, who did not pretend both to reaſon and Scripture for their Tenets (how damnable ſoever) and ſome of them, ſuch as were unanſwerable by humane reaſon, ſetting aſide the churches authority and Apoſtolical tradition. For who can prove by private reaſon, or by all the reaſon of man againſt the *Arians*, that a ſpiritual and indiviſible ſubſtance (ſuch as God is) could beget a natural Son of himſelf, without a mother? or againſt the *Sabellians* and *Trinitarians*, That the ſame indiviſible Eſſence or Divine Nature can be at once in three diſtinct Perſons, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt? or againſt *Neſtor* and *Eutiches*, That one perſon can ſubſiſt in two different natures, the divine and humane in Chriſt, which notwithſtanding are high fundamentals in Chriſtianity. In all theſe, and many others, privare reaſon muſt either bend the knee, and be captivate to faith, or become Atheiſm.

Finally, becauſe if private reaſon were the only Judg of controverſies, it would evidently follow, the General councils of all former ages, (which have commanded all perſons under pain of damnation to obey their definitions, and

ſubmit

ſubmit to their Decrees) were the moſt tyrannical and unjuſt Aſſemblies that ever were, in uſurping ſuch a power over mens conſciences, and conſequently that there neither is, nor ever was any ſuch thing on earth, as a church (or obliging guide in matters of faith) and church-government.

Ob. You therefore believe the church to be infallible, and whatever elſe you believe, becauſe you judg it reaſonable to believe it, and your very act of faith it ſelf is an act of reaſon; therefore reaſon is the only Judg of controverſies.

Anſw. The diſcourſe and approbation of reaſon is alwayes a previous and neceſſary condition, to our deliberate and rational acts of faith, and the very acts themſelves are acts of reaſon, not diſcourſing, but ſimply aſſenting: All this I grant, yet I deny your conſequence, becauſe our acts of faith are not ultimately reſolved into private reaſon (which often is inforc'd to captivate) but into the authority of God revealing, and the church propoſing. *I believe it* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *becauſe it is impoſſible* (viz. to humane reaſon.)

Ob. There is no Apoſtolical Tradition for the churches *Infallibility*.

Anſw. Yes, a more univerſal one, then for the very Canon of Scripture it ſelf: (which notwithſtanding you believe on that ſcore, if

at

at all) For there is not any one book, either of the Old or New Testament, which hath not been rejected by some Heretique or other: if therefore it be sufficient proof of an universal tradition for the whole Canon of Scripture, that some one or two General Councils only have set down the number and names of all the books of Scripture, though not without some variety, and that the Fathers have given testimony to them, some to some books, some to others, but few to all, and that the church in after-ages hath accepted them for such, how much more universal is the tradition for the churches infallibility, which is vertually decided and attested by the Anathema's, and definitions of all the General Councils that ever were, condemning all who did not humbly obey and subscribe to them, every decision being attested by all the Fathers, (no one contradicting or condemning the stile) and most unanimously accepted by the whole church of after ages.

Objections from Fathers and Councils solved.

Ob. THe Council of *Frankford* condemned the second Nicene Council for giving Soveraign honor to Images, as you may see in the preface of the Caroline books.

Answ. The second council of *Nice* allowes no such honor to images, but only a salutation or honorary worship, not true *Latria* (or Soveraign

raign honor) which it defines to be due to God only, *Acts* 1. 7. The Caroline books are of no authority, they say that council was not approved by the Pope, which is false, and that it was held at *Constantinople* in *Bythinia*, whereas *Constantinople* is in *Thrace*.

Ob. The *Lateran Council* under Pope *Leo* 10. Sess. 11. defined, a *Pope to be above a Council*, and the *Council of Constance* Sess. 4. defined a council to be above a Pope.

Answ. Neither part was ever yet owned by the church for an œcumenical decree or definition, and if it were, it would be answer'd, that the *Lateran Council* defined only a Pope to be above a Council taken without a Pope, or not approved, and that the Council of Constance only defined a Council approved by a Pope, to be above a Pope without a Council, which definitions are not contradictory, no more then to say, one part of any thing is bigger then another, and the whole bigger then both; so that from hence it cannot be inferr'd, that either Council err'd; nor was either decree approved by the Pope.

Ob. The Council of *Basil* defined, *That a Council was above a Pope.*

Answ. The Decree was not approved, nor any other of that Council, but only such as concerned Church-benefices. See *Eugenius* with *Turrecremata*. l. 2. c. 100.

Ob.

Ob. The Council of *Ariminum* defined *Arianism.*

Answ. It did not, and that equivocal decree which was there made, was never approved by the Pope; and the Fathers themselves, (who were deluded by the Arians, with words that bore a double sense, when they perceiv'd the fraud) lamented, and renounced the fact.

Ob. The Council of *Trent* err'd, by adding to the Canon of Scripture.

Answ. It did not: The third Council of *Carthage* approved all the same books by name, excepting *Baruch*, whom they comprized with the Prophet *Hieremy*, whose Secretary he was, and this 1200. years ago.

Ob. The Fathers err'd some in one thing, some in another.

Answ. A part, I grant, all together (speaking of any one age) I deny, and they all submitted to the church; and so do likewise our Schoolmen, who differ only in opinion concerning School-points undefined, not in faith.

Ob. S. *Austin* tells S. *Hierome*, that he esteems none but the writers of the Canonical books to have been infallible in all they write, and not to erre in any thing.

Answ. Neither do we, we esteeme not the writers of Councils infallible in all they write, nor yet the Councils themselves, but only in the œcumenical decrees, or definitions of Faith.

Ob.

Ob. S. *Auguſtine Epiſt.* 112. ſayes, We are only bound to believe the canonical Scriptures, without dubitation; but for other witneſſes, we may believe, or not believe them, according to the weight of their authority.

Anſw. He ſpeaks in a particular caſe, in which nothing had been defined by the church; namely, Whether God could be ſeen with corporal eyes? but the Decrees of general councils are of divine authority, as we have proved; and therefore according to S. *Auguſtine*, to be believed without dubitation.

Ob. S. *Athanaſius* (in his Epiſtle to the Biſhops of *Africa*) tells the Arians, they in vaine ran about to ſeek councils, ſince the Scripture is more powerful then all councils.

Anſw. He ſayes it was vain for them, who had rejected the general council of *Nice*, nor doubt we but the Scripture hath in many reſpects a preheminence above the definitions of general councils, and a higher degree of infallibility, yet theſe alſo are infallible in points of faith.

I conclude this Article with that Decree of the council of *Baſil*, *The Catholique Church is inriched with ſo great priviledg by Chriſt our Saviour, &c. that we firmly believe ſhe cannot erre in thoſe things which are neceſſary to ſalvation*, Anno Dom. 1431. reſponſ. Synod. de authoritate Conſilii Generalis.

Article VI.

The true Church demonſtrated by her Sanctity and Miracles.

OUr Tenet is, *That the Roman Catholique Church is known, and evidently diſtinguiſh'd from all falſe Churches, not only by the marks and properties by us premiſed, but alſo by her ſanctity and power of doing miracles*, and is proved thus.

The Argument.

1. THat is the true Church, and lawful Spouſe of Chriſt, which is eminent for Sanctity of Diſcipline and Doctrine, and for Miracles.
2. But the Roman Catholique Church, and no other, is eminent for Sanctity of Diſcipline

Diſcipline and Doctrine, and for Miracles.

3. Therefore the Roman Catholique Church, and no other, is the true Church, and lawful Spouſe of Chriſt.

The *major* for Sanctity is proved by that Article of the Apoſtles Creed, *I believe the holy Catholique Church*, not Roman, as alſo by theſe texts of holy Scripture; *Chriſt gave himſelf for his Church, cleanſing her by the laver of water* (Baptiſm) *in the Word, that he might preſent her to himſelf a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, but that ſhe might be holy and unſpotted*, Epheſ. 26. 27. *Theſe things ye were* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *but ye are waſh'd, but ye are ſanctified, but ye are juſtified in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Spirit of our God*, 1 Cor. 6. 10. *A good tree brings forth good fruit, by their fruit ye ſhall know them*, S. Mat. 7. 17. 20. *Strait is the gate, and narrow the way which leads to life, &c. If thou wilt be perfect, go and ſell all thou haſt, and give to the poor, &c. and come and follow me*, S. Mat. 19. 21. *There be Eunuchs who have gelded themſelves for the Kingdom of heaven, he that can take, let him take*, S. Mat. 10. 12. *Obey your Prelates, and be ſubject to them, &c. Heb.* 13. 17.

Now that the Roman Catholique Church hath abounded with, and brought forth Saints

in all ages (which is a pregnant and convincing proof of our second Proposition) is manifest by the Chronicles and Martyrologies of the whole Christian world, & Legend of Lyes. Nebulo/ S. *Augustine*, and his fellows, who converted England, when they were received into Canterbury (saith *Hollinshed part* 1. *p.* 100.) began to follow the trade of the Apostles, exercising themselves in continual prayer, fasting, watching, and preaching, despising all worldly things, and living in all points according to the doctrine which they taught.

S. *Francis*, S. *Bennet*, and S. *Dominick*, were all eminent for sanctity of life, as the Magdeburgian Centurists confess, *Centur.* 13. *col.* 11. 79. but I never yet heard of any Protestant Saints in the world: Add hereunto what the Catholique Church teaches, That the Commandements are possible, nay must be kept; she teaches the necessity of contrition, confession, and satisfaction, with many other penal practises of self-denial; she teaches obedience to Priests and spiritual Pastors, in things belonging to the soul, and the Government of the church; she teaches much fasting, prayer, and mortification; she exhorts to good works, voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience.

The contrary to all which holy doctrines are taught by Protestants, and other Sectaries.

Her

Her churches are open, and divine Service ſaid not only on all Sundaies and Holy daies, but every day in the week, and that the greateſt part in the forenoon. There is five times more preaching and catechiſing, and ten times more faſting and praying in the Catholique Church, then in the Proteſtant; her Sacraments are more and more frequented, and inſtead of an innumerable multitudes of religious men and women that are in the Catholike Church, who have freely forſaken all things to follow Chriſt, and totally relinquiſh'd the riches, pleaſures, and preferments of this life to ſerve him the remainder of their daies, in vows and practiſes of holy poverty, obedience, and chaſtity. Proteſtants have an innumerable company of Sects and Sectmaſters, that daily ſpring out of their ſtock, ſuch as are continually broaching new hereſies, and alwayes at defiance one with another.

The *major*, as to the power of miracles, is proved by theſe promiſes of Chriſt, *He that believeth in me, the works that I do, he ſhall do, and greater*, S. John 14. 10. *Thoſe that believe in me, theſe ſignes ſhall follow, in my Name they ſhall caſt out devils, they ſhall lay hands upon the ſick, and they ſhall be whole*, S. Mark 6. 17.

The *minor* is proved by theſe enſuing undeniable teſtimonies; firſt Proteſtants, and other Sectaries pretend, that miracles have ceaſed

ſed ever ſince Chriſt and his Apoſtles time, becauſe they and their Sect-maſters have never yet been able to do any, a ſure conviction that they want this Mark. Secondly, hiſtories (as well of enemies as friends) have recorded many famous miracles wrought in all ages by the Catholique Church. The *Magdeburgian Centuriſts*, although Proteſtants (ſuch is evidence & force of truth) have recorded many great miracles done by Catholikes in their 13.c. of every century for 1300. years together after Chriſt.

S. *Francis* of *Aſſiſinna*, fifteen daies before his death, had wounds freſhly bleeding in his hands, feet, and ſide, ſuch as Chriſt had on the Croſs, and this by miracle, *Mat. Paris.* pag. 319. One *Paul Form* having ſtoln two conſecrated Hoſts of the B. Euchariſt out of a church, ſold one of them to the Jews, who out of malice and contempt ſtab'd it, ſaying, *If thou be the God of the Chriſtians, manifeſt thy ſelf*, whereupon bloud miraculouſly iſſued out of the Hoſt, for which fact 38. of them were burnt at *Knoblock* in *Brandenburg*, and all the reſt of the Jews were baniſhed out of that Marquiſate. This is recorded by *Pontianus* in his fifth book of memorable things, and by *John Mandevil* a Proteſtant, in his book *de locis communibus. pag.* 87. as alſo by *Oſiander. Epiſt.* 116. p. 28. notwithſtanding this confeſſion of adverſaries, I will alſo add ſome Fathers.

Fathers

Fathers for this point.

IN the third Age S. *Cyprian*, *A certain Woman* (ſaith he) *When ſhe would with unworthy hands have opened her coffer, wherein was the holy thing of our Lord* (the B. Euchariſt) *fire ſprung up, whereby ſhe was ſo terrified, that ſhe durſt not touch it.* Sermon de lapſis.

In the fourth age *Optatus* relates how the *Heretiques caus'd the Euchariſt to be thrown to dogs, which dogs thereupon all raging tore their Maſters in pieces, as guilty of the holy Body.* l. 2. contra Donatiſt.

In the ſame Age S. *Gregory Nyſſen* recounts how S. *Gregory Neoceſarienſis* by his faith and prayers removed a mountain to make roome for the foundation of a church, according to that promiſe of Chriſt; *If you have faith as a Muſtard ſeed, you ſhall ſay to this mountain, remove from hence thither, and it ſhall be done, and nothing ſhall be impoſſible to you.* S. Mat. 17. 20. for which miracle he was called *Thaumaturgus, in l. de vita S. Gregor. Nicephorus* hath recorded the ſame miracle, l. 6. c. 7.

In the ſame Age S. *Chryſoſtome* affirms, that *not only the reliques of S.* Peter *and* Paul *did miracles, and cured diſeaſes,* Acts 5. 12, 15, 19. *but alſo the reliques of many other Saints;* and he exemplifies in *S. Babilas* the Martyr, whoſe mira-

cles he records, *l. de Babil. Martyre. tom.* 5. inferring from thence againſt Infidels, that Chriſt is God; who hath wrought ſuch wonders by the duſt of his ſervants.

In the ſame Age *S. Ambroſe* reports, That his Brother *Satyrus* was miraculouſly preſerved from drowning in a ſhipwrack by the B. Sacrament of the Euchariſt, which he had faſtened in a ſtole about his neck. *Funeral Oration on the death of Satyrus.* c. 7.

In the fifth Age *S. Auguſtine*, having recounted many miracles wrought at *S. Stephens* Monument, which he himſelf was an eye-witneſs of, affirms at length, that *if he ſhould record all that he knew to have been done, he muſt fill books.* l. de civitat. Dei 22. c. 8.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. MIracles have ceaſed ever ſince Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

Anſw. You contradict the plain promiſes of Chriſt made to his church without limitation, as alſo the Hiſtories and Records of all Chriſtendome.

Ob. Signs and miracles were given to unbelievers, not to believers, therefore they are now unneceſſary.

Anſw. No, they are not, for they very much confirm the immediate care and providence of God over his church, they excellently demonſtrate

ſtrate his omnipotence, and there be many diſbelievers ſtill, the more's the pity.

Ob. Why do not then your Prieſts do miracles? we would be glad to ſee ſome of their doing.

Anſw. Becauſe of your incredulity, as our Saviour told the Jews, *S. Mat.* 17. 19. yet they do many in Gods appointed time and place, (as the Records of the church will teſtifie) though not to ſatisfie your ſinful curioſity. See *Franeis à S. Clara* in his *Paralipomena*, who recounts many great and evident miracles.

Article VII.

The Popes Supremacy asserted.

Our Tenet is, *That the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, is the true Successor of* S. Peter, *and Head of the whole Church of God*, which hath in part been proved already, by our Catalogue of Chiefe Pastors, (who were all Popes of *Rome*) and by the Councils of all Ages, approved by them, and owning them for such, and is yet farther proved thus.

The first Argument.

1. THe Foundation hath a prehemi-nence of firmitude and stability before the rest of the building which is founded on it, and the Shepheard is Head of his Flock, and above his Sheep. 2. But

3. But S. *Peter*, next after Chriſt himſelfe, was the foundation of the whole church, and Paſtor of the whole flock.

3. Therefore S. *Peter* next after Chriſt, had a preheminence over the whole church, and was Head of the whole flock, and above all the other ſheep, of which number were the reſt of the Apoſtles.

The *major* is proved, becauſe the foundation ſupporteth the reſt of the building; (*We are built on the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief Corner-ſtone*, Epheſ. 2. 20.) and the Shepheard hath a power to feed and govern his whole Flock.

The *minor* is proved, *Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, S. Mat. 16. 18. (the whole was built on him) and for a reward of *Peters* ſpecial dilection, (for he loved Chriſt more then the reſt of the Apoſtles) he ſaid to him; *Feed my lambs, feed my lambs, feed my ſheep*, S. John 21. 16, 17, 18. (a Commiſſion to feed all without exception.)

Ano-

Another Argument.

1. HE that is by Gods appointment to confirm others in the Faith, and is generally ſet before others in the Scripture, muſt needs be greater then thoſe others in power and dignity.
2. But S. *Peter* by our Saviours own appointment. was to confirm the Apoſtles in the Faith, and is generally pre-fer'd before them all in holy Scripture.
3. Therefore S. *Peter* was above the reſt of the Apoſtles in power and dignity, and therefore the Head and Primate of the reſt.

The *major* is proved, becauſe the ſtronger is not confirmed by the weaker, nor the leſs worthy to be ſet before the more worthy, generally ſpeaking.

The *minor* is proved, *I have pray'd for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not; and thou being at length converted, confirm thy Brethren*, S. Lu. 22. 31. *The names of the twelve are theſe, the firſt* Simon

Simon, *who is called* Peter, *&c. S. Mat.* 10. 2. *S. Mark* 3. S. *Lu.* 2. and *Acts* the 1.

What hath been ſaid to prove *S. Peters* primacy, proves alſo the primacy of his Succeſſour, the Pope of *Rome.*

Fathers for this point.

IN the firſt Age S. *Dionyſius*, the *Areopagite* affirms, That *he and* Timothy *were both preſent at the B. Virgin* Mary's *death, to behold that Body which gave the beginning of life; and that there was alſo preſent, both* James *the Brother of our Lord, and* Peter *the Supreme, and moſt antient top of Divines:* He is cited by S. *John Damaſcen, Orat.* 2. *de dormit. deipar. ſub finem.*

In the ſecond Age Irenæus; *All Churches round about ought to reſort to the Roman Church, by reaſon of her more powerful principality,* l. 3. c. 3. And again, *The Roman Church is the greateſt and moſt antient, founded at Rome by S.* Peter, *and S.* Paul, l. 3. cont. Valent. c. 3.

In the third Age Origen; *When the chiefe charge of feeding Chriſts ſheep was given to S.* Peter, *and the Church founded upon him, &c. there was required of him the confeſſion of no vertue, but of charity.* in c. 6. Epiſt. ad Roman.

In the ſame Age S. Cyprian; *We hold* Peter *the Head and Root of the Church.* Epiſt. ad Julian. And in another place, he calls the Church

Church of Rome *S. Peters Chair.* Epiſt. 55.

In the fourth Age *S. Baſil* calls *S. Peter, That bleſſed one, who was prefer'd before the reſt of the Apoſtles.* Sermon de Judicio Dei.

In the ſame Age S. Athanaſius; *Thou art* Peter, *and upon thy foundation the Pillars of the Church, that is the Biſhops, are fortified.* in Epiſt. ad Felicem.

In the ſame Age S. Epiphanius; *He choſe* Peter *to be the Captain of his Diſciples*, Hæreſ. 51.

In the ſame Age *S. Cyril* of Hieruſalem, *Peter the Prince* (ſaith he) *and moſt excellent of all the Apoſtles.* Catecheſ. 2.

In the ſame Age S. Chryſoſtome; *The Paſtor and Head of the Church was once a poor Fiſherman.* Homil. 55. in Matthæum.

In the ſame Age Ecumenius; *Not* James, *but* Peter *riſeth up, as being both more fervent, and alſo the Preſident of the Diſciples.* in c. 1. Actorum.

In the ſame Age Optatus Milevitanus; *In this Chair ſate* Peter *the Head of all the Apoſtles.* l. 2. cont. Parmen.

In the ſame Age Euſebius Emiſſenus, *He firſt committed his lambs, afterwards his ſheep to* Peter, *becauſe he made him not only Paſtor, but Paſtor of the Paſtors.* Sermon de Nativ. *S. Jo.*

In the ſame Age S. Ambroſe; *Andrew firſt followed our Saviour, yet* Andrew *received not the primacy, but* Peter. in 2 Cor. 12.

In

In the fifth Age *S. Auguſtine* ſpeaking of S. *Peters* penance, ſayes, *He cures the whole bodies diſeaſe in the very Head of the Church.* Serm. 12. de 4. temporibus. And again, *Peter the Head of the Apoſtles, the Gate-keeper of heaven, and the foundation of the Church.* Epiſt. 86. And in another place, *Of whom* Peter *the Apoſtle, by reaſon of the primacy of his Apoſtleſhip, bore the perſon &c.* Tract. ultimo in Ioannem.

The firſt *Nicene Council* defined, *That he, who holds the Sea of Rome, is the Head and chief of all the Patriarchs, ſeeing he is the firſt, as* Peter, *to whom power is given over all Chriſtian Princes, and all their people, as he who is the Vicar of Chriſt our Lord over all people, and the univerſal Church of Chriſt, and whoever ſhall contradict this, is excommunicated by the Synod.* Can. 39. Arab.

The Council of *Calcedon*; *We throughly conſider truly, that all primacy, and chief honor, is to be kept for the Arch-biſhop of Old Rome.* Action 16. See more above in the Councils.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. PIlate had power over Chriſt himſelfe, *Thou ſhouldeſt not* (ſaith he) *have any power againſt me, unleſs it were given thee from above,* Jo. 19. 11. therefore temporal Princes are above the Pope.

Anſw.

Answ. I distinguish your antecedent, he had a power of permission over Christ, I grant; a power of jurisdiction, I deny, and so do all good Christians. Nor is your consequence less to be deny'd, speaking of spiritual things, and things belonging to Church-Government, in which we only defend the Popes Supremacy, and that without all prejudice to Princes and chief Magistrates in their supremacy of temporal affairs.

Ob. S. *Paul* sayes, *At* Cæsars *Judgment-seat I stand, where I ought to be judged, &c. I appeal to Cæsar*: therefore the Emperour is above the Pope.

Answ. S. Paul appeal'd to *Cæsar*, as to a Judg of fact, not of right, so that your consequence is false.

Ob. The Kings of the Gentiles over-rule them, but you not so, S.Lu.22.25.

Answ. Christ there forbids spiritual superiours to lord it over inferiours, so the Greek word (κατακυριευουσιν αὐτῶν) signifies, yet he there expressely mentions a greater and a lesser, a superiour and inferiour among them.

Ob. Christ is the foundation (of the Church) *and other foundation no man can lay*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11.

Answ. Other principal foundation no man can lay, I grant, other subordinate, I deny; for he himself hath laid *Peter* (*Thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock will I build my Church*, S.Mat. 16. 18.)

18.) and the reſt of the Apoſtles, were built on the foundation of them all, though not equally, *Epheſ.* 2. 20.

Ob. S. *Cyprian* (*de unit. Eccl.*) ſayes, *The Apoſtles were equal in dignity.* And S. *Hierome* affirms *the Church was equally founded on them all.* l. cont. Jovin.

Anſw. They were equal in their calling to the Apoſtleſhip, I grant, in their power of Government and Juriſdiction, I deny: And the Church was equally founded on them all before a Head was conſtituted, I grant; after a Head was conſtituted, I deny, and ſo do thoſe Fathers; S. *Cyprian* ſaying in the ſame place, *That Chriſt diſpoſed the Origen of Unity beginning from one,* (Peter.) And S. *Hierome* tells us, *He choſe one of the twelve, that a Head being conſtituted, the occaſion of Schiſme might be taken away.*

Ob. One body with two heads is monſtrous.

Anſw. Not if one be principal, and the other ſubordinate, or miniſterial only, as in our preſent caſe. So Chriſt is the Head of the man, and the man of the woman, 1 *Cor.* 11. without any monſtroſity.

Ob. S. *Gregory* rejects the name of Univerſal Arch-biſhop as Antichriſtian. *l.* 7. *indict.* 2. *Epiſt.* 96.

Anſw. He rejects it as it excludes all others

from being Bishops, I grant; as it only signifies one to be supreme, and above all others, I deny, and so doth he himself, saying in the same book (*Ep.* 62.) *If there be any crime found in Bishops, I know no Bishop but is subject to the Sea Apostolique.* And l. 4. indict. 13. Epist. 32. *The care and principality of the Church hath been committed to the holy Apostle, and Prince of the Apostles S.* Peter, *yet is not he called Universal Apostle, as if there were no other Apostle but he.* You see in what sense he rejects the word (*Universal.*)

Ob. The first Constantinopolitan Council, and the Council of Calcedon, decreed the Constantinopolitan Sea to be equal with that of Rome.

Answ. In certain priviledges, I grant, in original Authority or Jurisdiction, I deny, and so does the said Council of *Calcedon*, saying, *We throughly consider truly, that all primacy and chief honor is to be kept for the Arch-bishop of Old Rome. Action* 16. nor was that Canon of the Council of *Constantinople* ever approved by the Pope, though it own'd the Church of *Rome* to be the Sea Apostolique, and sought but primacy in the second place, and after it.

Ob. The Council of *Nice* sayes, *Let the antient custome be kept in* Egypt, Lybia, *and* Pentapolis, *that the Bishop of* Alexandria *hath power over all those, because the Bishop of* Rome *also hath such a custome*, Can. 6.

Answ.

Answ. The Bishop of *Rome* had a custome to permit such a power to the Bishop of *Alexandria*; the Greek Text sayes, *Because to the Bishop of* Rome *also this is accustomed*, which argues him to be above the other.

Ob. The Emperours heretofore called and presided in General Councils.

Answ. They call'd them instrumentally, I grant; by way of spiritual Jurisdiction, I deny. And they presided also in them for peace, and ornament, true; for definition or judgment, 'tis most false: That alwayes was reserved to the Popes, *I will not sit among them as Emperour* (saith *Constantine* in his Epist. to Pope *Leo* about the sixth General Council) *I will not speak imperiously among them, but as one of them, and what the Fathers shall ordain, that I will execute.* Emperours subscribed councils, not in order to constitution, but execution. *God* (saith *Constantine* to the Nicene council) *hath made you Priests, and given you power to judg us, but you may not be judged of men. In Rufino.*

Ob. What think you of Pope *Joane*? was she an Universal Bishop also?

Answ. I think him rather a particular fool, who can believe so gross a fable: 'Twas the credulous relation of one *Martinus Polonus*, a silly man, (the only Author for it, though Protestant Writers have falsly cited others) who

hath ſufficiently diſcredited his own Narration; For he tells you, ſhe was born at *Mountes* in England; (there having never been any ſuch place heard of) and that ſhe was bred up at *Athens*, an Univerſity not then in being, but deſtroy'd many years before, a prety likely tale.

Ob. You Roman Catholiques, as I have heard, (if the Pope excommunicate a Tyrant or Heretical Prince) hold it lawful for his own ſubjects to kill him.

Anſw. You have heard a loud ſlander, we abhominate and deteſt the Doctrine. It is defined by the council of *Conſtance*, and therefore of faith with us, *That 'tis Heretical, to affirm it lawful for a Subject to kill his Prince upon any pretence whatſoever.* Seſſ. 15.

Anſw. Mariana the Jeſuite printed the Opinion.

Anſw. True, by way of Probleme he did; but his book was condemn'd, and publikely burnt by a Provincial council of his own Order.

Ob. At leaſt you hold, the Pope can diſpenſe with your Allegeance to Princes, and if he diſpenſe, you are not bound to keep any Faith with them, or any Heretiques.

Anſw. We hold, That our allegeance to Princes is not diſpenſible by any authority on earth; and are as ready to defend our Prince, or

or civil Magiſtrate, with hazard of our lives and fortunes, even againſt the Pope himſelf, if he invade them, as againſt any other enemy. We eſteem our ſelves obliged to keep Faith even with Infidels: And the council of *Trent* hath declared, *That to violate any leaſt point of publike Faith given to Heretiques, is a thing puniſhable by the Law of God and man. Seſſ.* 15. 18. What this or that particular Doctor may hold, or the Popes flatterers, if he have any, addes nothing to the *Creed* of *Catholiques*, nor is it juſtly chargeable on the whole church.

We conclude this whole Treatiſe of the church by way of corollary, with one ſhort Argument.

1. That is the true Church, and no other, to which all theſe foreſaid marks and properties plainly agree (viz. a continued *Succeſsion* from Chriſt to this time. 2. *Viſibility*. 3. *Unity*. 4. *Univerſality*. 5. *Infallibility*. 6. *Sanctity*. 7. The *Power of Miracles*, and to be governed by one Supreme Head, and he a Biſhop.)
2. But all theſe foreſaid marks and properties agree plainly and undeniably to the Roman Catholique Church,

and no other, as hath been proved.

3. Therefore the Roman Catholique Church, and no other, is the true Church.

Having thus character'd and pointed out the Church, we come now to vindicate her particular and most principal Doctrines from all aspersions cast on her by Heretiques. And for our clearer performance of this task, we shall first shew you the Churches Rule of Faith, by which she hath conserved her self infallible, and in the purity of Apostolical Doctrine, to this time, and shall do so to the worlds end.

ARITCLE VIII.

Of Apostolical Tradition.

OUr Tenet is, *That the true Rule of Christian Faith is Apostolical Tradition; or a delivery of Doctrine from Father to Son, by hand to hand, from Christ and his Apostles, and that nothing ought to be receiv'd as Faith, but what is proved to have been so deliver'd*, which we prove thus.

The first Argument.

1. That is now the true Rule of Faith which was the essential meanes of planting and conserving it at first.
2. But Oral and Apostolical Tradition, not written books, was the essential means of planting and conserving it at first.

3. Therefore Oral and Apoſtolical Tradition, not written books, is the true Rule of Faith.

The *major* is proved, becauſe the Rule of Faith muſt be immutable, and the ſame in all Ages, as the Faith it ſelf is.

The *minor* is proved, becauſe the firſt Goſpel was not written till eight years after the death of Chriſt, or thereabouts; in which ſpace the Apoſtles had preach'd, and planted the Faith of Chriſt in many Nations, over almoſt all the world. Add to this, that many Ages were paſs'd before all the books of Scripture were diſperſed and accepted for Canonical by the whole Church; ſo that when any difference aroſe in points of Faith among the Chriſtians of the firſt Age, they were not to enquire what had been written, but whether the Apoſtles had ſo [illegible].

A ſecond Argument.

1. That is the true Rule of Faith, by which we may infallibly be aſſured, both what Doctrines Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, and what books they wrote, and without which we can

can never be infallibly assured of those things.

2. But by Apostolical Tradition we may infallibly be assured, both what Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught, and what books they wrote, and by no other means.

3. Therefore Apostolical Tradition is the true Rule of Faith.

The *major* is manifest, because in the Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the books which they wrote, are contained all things that are of faith; therefore the infallible means of knowing them, is the infallible and true rule of Faith.

The *minor* is proved; because a full report from whole worlds of Fathers, to whole worlds of Sons, of what they heard and saw, is altogether infallible, since sensible evidence in a world of eye-witnesses, unanimously concurring, is altogether infallible, how fallible soever men may be in their particulars; and such a report, such an evidence, is *Apostolical Tradition*, for all the Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught, and all the books they wrote; therefore infallible.

A third Argument.

1. If Christ and his Apostles have given to the Church of the first Age [together with all points of Faith] this for the Rule of Faith, that nothing on pain of damnation ought to be delivered for Faith, but what they had receiv'd from them as such, then it was impossible that they should deliver any thing for Faith to the second age, but what they had receiv'd from them as such, and so from age to age to this time.
2. But Christ and his Apostles did give the Church of the first age [together with all points of Faith] this for the Rule of Faith; that nothing on pain of damnation ought to be delivered for Faith, but what they had receiv'd from them as such.
3. Therefore it was impossible that the Church of the first age, should deliver any thing to the Church of the second for Faith, but what they had receiv'd as such from Christ and his Apostles, or consequently, that they should erre in Faith.

The *major* is proved; because to make her deliver more for Faith then she had received in this supposition, the whole Church must either have forgotten what she had beene taught from her infancy in matters of salvation,

tion, and damnation, which is impoſſible in a whole world of ear and eye-witneſſes, as hath been ſhewed; or elſe the whole Church muſt have ſo far broken with reaſon, which is the very nature of man, as to conſpire in a notorious lye to damn her ſelf, and her poſterity, by ſaying ſhe hath received ſuch or ſuch a point for Faith, which in her own conſcience ſhe knew ſhe had not ſo received; and this is more impoſſible then the former, even as impoſſible, as for men not to be men; as ſhall be ſhewed in the next argument.

The *minor* is proved by theſe poſitive texts of Scripture.

Therefore Brethren ſtand ye faſt, and hold the Traditions which ye have learned, whether by word, or by our Epiſtle, 2 Theſ. 2. 15. *Theſe things which ye have been taught, and heard, and ſeene in me, theſe do ye*, Phil. 4. *So we have preach'd, and ſo ye have believed*, 1 Cor. 14. 15. *How ſhall they believe in whom they have not heard? and how ſhall they hear without a Preacher?* Rom. 10. 17. *The things that thou haſt heard of me before many witneſſes, the ſame commend thou to faithful men which ſhall be fit to teach others alſo*, 2 Tim. 2. 2. *If any man ſhall preach otherwiſe then ye have received, let him be* Anathema, Gal. 1. 9. *Although we, or an Angel from heaven preach to you, beſides that which we have preached to you, be he* Anathema, Gal. 1. 8.

The

The laſt Argument for Tradition.

1. To make a whole world of wiſe and diſintereſted men break ſo far with their own nature, as to conſpire in a notorious lye to damn themſelves, and their poſterity (which is the only means remaining to make an Apoſtolical Tradition fallible) ſuch a force of hopes or fears muſt fall upon them all at once, as may be ſtronger then nature in them.
2. But ſuch a force of hopes or fears can never fall on the whole world or Church at once, which is diſperſed over all Nations.
3. Therefore it is impoſſible for the whole world, or Church at once, to conſpire in ſuch a lye, or conſequently to erre in Faith.

'Tis the aſſurance of this impoſſibility that moves the Church of the preſent age to reſolve her Faith and Doctrines into the precedent age, and ſo from age to age, from ſons to fathers, up to the mouth of Chriſt and his Apoſtles teaching it, ſaying; *We believe it, becauſe we have received it.*

But if we refer the whole tryal of Faith to the arbitrement of Scripture, I ſee nothing more evident, then that this one *Argument ad homi-*

hominem gives the cauſe into our hands, ſince it clearly proves either many controverted Catholike Doctrines are ſufficiently contain'd in Sripture, or many Proteſtant ones are not: and thus I prove my diſcourſe.

ALl Proteſtant Tenets (ſay you) are ſufficiently contain'd in Scripture; but many Catholike Doctrines (ſay I) deny'd by Proteſtants, are as evident in Scripture, as divers Proteſtant Tenets; therefore many Catholique Doctrines deny'd by Proteſtants are ſufficiently contain'd in Scripture.

He that has hardineſs enough to deny this concluſion, let him compare the texts that recommend the Churches authority in deciding controverſies, and expounding Articles of Faith, with thoſe that ſupport the Proteſtant private ſpirit, or particular judgment of diſcretion; let him compare the places that favour *Prieſtly abſolution*, with thoſe on which they ground the *neceſſity* (not to ſtand upon the lawfulneſs) *of Infant Baptiſm*; let him compare the paſſages of the Bible for the *Real preſence* of our Saviours body in the Euchariſt, for the primacy of *S. Peter*, for the authority of *Apoſtolical Traditions*, though unwritten, with whatever he can cite, to prove the three diſtinct perſons in the B. *Trinity*, the conſubſtantiality of the Son with the Father, the pro-

ceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from both; the obligation of *Sunday* inſtead of the *Sabbath*, ſo expreſly commanded in the Moral Law; and when he has turn'd over all his Bible as often as he pleaſes, I ſhall offer him only this requeſt, either to admit the argument, or teach me to anſwer it.

The ſame *Syllogiſm* may with equal evidence be apply'd to the negative, as well as poſitive doctrines, on either ſide.

All Catholike points deny'd by Proteſtants, are ſufficiently (ſay you) condemn'd in Scripture: But many points imbraced by Proteſtants, are as clearly (ſay I) condemned in *Scripture*, as divers they deny in oppoſition to Catholiques; therefore many points imbrac'd by Proteſtants, are ſufficiently condemn'd in Scripture.

Where does the Bible ſo plainly forbid *Prayer for the Dead*, as this darling errour and fundamental principle of Proteſtancy, that any one, however ignorant, however unſtable, ought to read the holy Scriptures, and unappealably judg of their ſenſe by his private interpretation? where is it ſo plainly forbidden to adore Chriſt in what place ſoever we believe him to be really preſent, as 'tis to work upon the Saturday? Thus if the Bible be conſtituted ſole Rule of Religion, Proteſtants clearly can neither condemn the Catholike, nor juſtifie their own. *Te-*

Teſtimonies of Antiquity for Tradition.

IN the ſecond age Irenæus. *If the Fathers had left us no Scripture at all, ought we not to follow the order of Traditions* l. 3. c. 4.

In the third age Tertullian. *What I believe I received from the preſent Church, the preſent Church from the Primitive, that from the Apoſtles, the Apoſtles from Chriſt.* l. de præſcrip. c. 21. 37.

In the ſame age S. Cyprian. *Know that in offering the Chalice* (viz. by mingling water with Wine) *we are admoniſhed to obſerve our Lords Tradition.*

In the ſame age Origen. *In our underſtanding Scripture, we muſt not depart from the firſt Eccleſiaſtical Tradition.* Tract. 27. in c. 23. S. Matthæi.

In the fourth age S. Athanaſius. *This Doctrine we have demonſtrated to have been delivered from hand to hand, by Fathers to Sons*, l. 1. de decret. Concil. Niceni.

In the ſame age S. Chryſoſtome. *It is evident that the Apoſtles did not deliver all things by writing, but many things without, and theſe be as worthy credit as the others.* On 2 Theſ. 2.

In the ſame age Epiphanius. *We muſt uſe Traditions, for the Scriptures have not all things.* Hæreſ. 61.

In

In the fifth age S. Auguſtine: *The Apoſtles commanded nothing hereof* (Rebaptization) *but that cuſtome which was oppoſed againſt* Cyprian *in it, is to be believed to proceed from their Tradition, as many things are which the whole Church holds, and are therefore well believed to be commanded by the Apoſtles, though not written.* l. 5. de baptiſm. c 23.

The ſecond Nicene Council defines thus: *Whoever ſhall dare to think otherwiſe, or teach after the cuſtome of wicked Heretiques, to violate Eccleſiaſtical Traditions, let him be* Anathema. Act. 7. p. 686. Anno Dom. 781.

The Council of *Sens* thus. *It is a dangerous thing to be in that errour, that nothing ought to be admitted which is not in Scripture; for many things were delivered from Chriſt to poſterity by the hands of the Apoſtles, from mouth to mouth, &c. which are to be held without all dubitation.* Decret. 5.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. YOu have made fruſtrate the Commandement of God for your Tradition, S. Mat. c. 15. v. 4. *Beware leſt any man deceive you by vain fallacy, according to the traditions of men*, Col. 2.

Anſw. Theſe texts are both againſt the vain Traditions of private men, not againſt Apoſtolical Traditions.

Ob.

Ob. There is no better way to decide controverſies, then by Scripture.

Anſw. Then by Scripture expounded by the Church, and according to the rule of Apoſtolicall tradition, I grant: then by Scripture according to the dead letter, or expounded by the private ſpirit, I deny. *For ſo* (as *Tertullian* ſayes) *there is no good got by diſputing out of the texts of Scripture, but either to make a man ſick or mad.* De præſcript.c.19.

Ob. *All Scripture divinely inſpired is profitable for teaching, for arguing, for reproving, and for inſtructing in righteouſneſs, that the man of God may be perfect, inſtructed to every good work;* 1 *Tim.*3.16,17. therefore Traditions are not neceſſary.

Anſw. S. *Paul* ſpeaks only there of the old Scripture, which *Timothy* had known from his childhood, (when little, if any, of the new could be written) as is plain by the precedent verſe, which we acknowledg to be profitable for all thoſe ules, but not ſufficient; neither will any more follow out of that text, if underſtood of the new Scriptures: ſo that your conſequence is vain, and of no force.

Ob. *If any one ſhall add to theſe, God ſhall add to him the plagues written in this Book,* Apoc.22: 18,19. Therefore it is not lawfull to add Traditions.

Anſw. It followes immediately, *And if any*

one shall diminish from the words of this prophecie, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, verſ. 19. By which S. *Iohn* evidently reſtrains that text to the book of his own Prophecies onely; which is not the whole rule of faith, and therefore by that you cannot exclude either the reſt of the Scriptures or Apoſtolicall Traditions from that Rule.

Ob. We may have a certain knowledg of all things neceſſary to ſalvation, by the Bible, or written Word onely.

Anſw. No, we cannot; for there have been, are and will be infinite diſputes about that to the worlds end, as well what books are canonicall and what not, as what the true ſenſe and meaning is of every verſe and chapter. Nor can we ever be infallibly aſſured of either, but by means of Apoſtolicall Tradition: ſo that if this be interrupted, and have failed for any one whole age together (as *Proteſtants* pretend it did for many) the whole Bible, for ought we know, might in that ſpace be changed and corrupted: nor can the contrary ever be evinced, without new revelation from God; the dead letter cannot ſpeak for it ſelf.

Ob. *Many other ſignes alſo did Ieſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this book, but theſe are written, that you may believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God, and that believing, you may have life in his name,* S. *John*

S. John 20. 30, 31. Therefore S. Johns Gospel contains all things necessary to salvation.

Answ. I deny your consequence; for S. *John* omitted many things of great moment, as our Lords Prayer, and his last Supper, which are both necessary to be believed. And though he say, *These things are written that we may believe, and have life*, he sayes not that these things *only* were written, or are sufficient for that purpose, which is the thing in question; so that he excludes not the rest of the Gospells nor Apostolical Traditions. And it is no unusual thing in Scripture to ascribe the whole effect to that which is but the cause in part; thus Christ promiseth beatitude to every single Christian vertue, S. *Matth.* 5. and S. *Paul*, salvation to every one that shall call on the name of our Lord, or confesse with his mouth the *Lord Jesus*, and believe that God hath raised him from the dead. *Rom*: 10. 4. 9, 10. yet more then this is requisite to salvation.

Ob. S. *Luke* tells us, *He hath written of all those things which Jesus did and taught.* Acts. 1: 1. Therefore all things necessary to salvation, are contained in his Gospel.

Answ. He writ of all the principal passages of his life and death, I grant, (and that was the whole scope or intent of the Evangelists) of all absolutely which he did and taught, I deny; for in the same chapter he tells us, that during

during the forty days which Christ remained with them after his Resurrection, he often appeared to them, instructing them in the things concerning the Kingdom of God, very few of which instructions are mentioned by S. *Luke*, nor does he or any other of the Evangelists say any thing in their Gospels of the coming of the Holy Ghost, or of the things by him revealed to the Church, which were great and many, according to that; *I have many things to say to you*, but you *cannot now bear them, but when the spirit of truth cometh he shall teach you all truth, &c. and the things that are to come he shall shew you*, S. John 16. 12, 13, 14. Add to this, *That, if all things which Jesus taught and did, should be written, the whole World would not contain the Books*, S. John c. 21. v. last. therefore your consequence is false, and that saying of S. *Luke* is to be limited.

Ob. At least the whole Bible contains all things necessary to salvation, either for beleife or practise for all sorts of men whatsoever, and that explicitly and plainly. Therefore the Bible is the rule of faith.

Answ. I deny both antecedent, and consequence. The three Creeds are not there; the foure first Councels are not there; there is nothing expresly prohibiting Poligamy or Rebaptization, nor expresly affirming three distinct Persons in one divine nature, or the Sons Consubstantiality to the Father, or the procession

procession of the H. Ghost from both, or that the H. Ghost is God, or for the necessity of Infant Baptism, or for changing the Saturday into Sunday, &c. all which notwithstanding are necessary to be known for the whole Church, and to be believed by us in particular (as Protestants will acknowledg) if they be once sufficiently propos'd to us by the Church. Nor is it sufficient, we believe all the Bible, unlesse we also believe it in the true sense, and be able to confute all Heresies out of it, (I speak of the whole Church) which she can never do, without the Rule of Apostolicall Tradition, in any of the points forementioned.

Ob. Doubtlesse for speculative points of Christian doctrine. Books are a safer and more infallible way, or rule, then orall Tradition.

Answ. You are mistaken; Books are infinitely more liable to casualties, and corruptions, then Traditions, as well by reason of the variety of languages into which they are translated, as the diversity of Translations; scarce any two Editions agreeing, but all pretending one to mend the other; besides the multiplicity of Copies and Copists, with the equivocation, and uncertainty of dead, and written words, if captiously wrested, or literally insisted on, who can prove any one Copy of the Bible to be infallible, or uncorrupted, (those that were written by the Apostles own hands, we have

not) or who can convince, that any one text of the Bible can have no other ſenſe or meaning, then what is convenient for his purpoſe, inſiſting only on the dead Letter? all which dangers and difficulties are avoyded by relying on Apoſtolicall Tradition, which bindes men under pain of damnation, to deliver nothing for faith, but what they have received as ſuch by hand to hand from age to age, and in the ſame ſenſe in which they have received it. *Think mee not fooliſh* (ſaies S. Auguſtin) *for uſing theſe termes; for I have ſo learned theſe things by Tradition, neither dare I deliver them to thee any other way, then as I have received them.* l. de utilit. cred. c. 3.

As to your difficulty of ſpeculative points, I anſwer, That the whole frame of neceſſary points of Chriſtian doctrine was in a manner made ſenſible and viſible by the externall and uniform practice of the Church. The incarnation and all the myſteries thereof, by the holy images of Chriſt erected in all ſacred places; the paſſion by the ſigne of the Croſſe uſed in the Sacraments, and ſet up in Churches. The death of Chriſt by the unbloudy ſacrifice of the Maſſe, which is a lively commemoration of it. The Trinity and Unity, by doing all things in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, &c. Now who can doubt, but that orall tradition thus ſeconded

ded by the outward and uniform practice of the whole world, is a much safer and more infallible rule, for conserving revealed verities, then books, or dead letters, which cannot explicate themselves.

Ob. If all things necessary to salvation be not contained in the whole Bible, how shall a man ever come to know, what is necessary to be known, either by the whole Church in generall, or by himself in particular?

Answ. For the whole Church in generall, she is obliged to know all timely revealed verities which are necessary to the salvation of all mankind, she being made by Christ the depository of all, and having the promise of divine assistance to all. And for each particular man, so much onely is necessary to be believed, as is sufficiently propos'd to him by the Church, and her Ministers, for the Word of God, or would at least be so propos'd, if he himself were not in fault; all which we may easily come to know, by means of Apostolical tradition, without which we can have no infallible assurance of any point of Christian doctrine.

Ob. You dance in a vicious circle, proving the Scripture and the Churches infallibility by Apostolicall tradition, and tradition by the Scripture and the Churches infallibility.

Answ. No: We go on by a right rule to-

wards heaven. We prove indeed the Churches infallibility, and the credibility of the Scriptures by Apostolicall tradition, but that is evident of it self, and admits no other proof. When we bring Scripture for either, we use it only as a secondary testimony, or argument *ad hominem*.

Apostol.l Trad.n then is evid.t of it self, & ye Bible not so!

Article IX.

Of Schiſm and Hereſie.

NOthing intrenching more on the rule of Faith, or the authority of the Church, then *Schiſm* and *Hereſie*: We ſhall here briefly ſhew what they are, and who are juſtly chargeable therewith.

OUr Tenet is, *That not onely Hereſie* (which is a wilfull ſeparation from the Doctrine of the Catholike Church) *but alſo Schiſm* (which is a ſeparation from her government) *is damnable and ſacrilegious, and that moſt Sectaries are guilty of both.*

The Argument.

1. All ſuch as are wilfully divided both from the doctrine and diſcipline of the Catholike Church are Schiſmaticks and Heretikes, and conſequently in a damnable ſtate.
2. But moſt Proteſtants and other Sectaries are wilfully divided both from the doctrine and

and diſcipline of the Catholike Church.

3. Therfore they are Schiſmaticks and Heretikes, and conſequently in a damnable ſtate.

The *major* is manifeſt out of the very notion and definition of ſchiſme and hereſie; the ſequel of it is proved thus by Scripture. *A man that is an Heretike after the firſt and ſecond admonition avoid, knowing that he that is ſuch an one is ſubverted and ſinneth, being condemned by his own judgment*, Titus 3.10. *There ſhall be lying maſters which ſhall bring in Sects of perdition, and deny him that bought them, the Lord, bringing upon themſelves ſpeedy perdition*, 2 S. Pet. 2. 1. S. *Jude* calls them *raging Waves of the Sea, foaming out their own confuſion; wandring ſtars, to whom the ſtorm of darkneſs is reſerved for ever*, Epiſt. v. 13. *I beſeech you, brethren, obſerve thoſe who make ſchiſms and ſcandalls contrary to the doctrine which you have been taught, and avoid them, for ſuch men ſerve not our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, but their own belly, and by kind ſpeeches, and bleſſings, ſeduce the heart of the ſimple*, Rom. 15. 17. *Woe to the World becauſe of ſcandalls, for it muſt needs be that ſcandalls come, but notwithſtanding woe to that man by whom ſcandalls come*, S. Mat. 18. 7, 17. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen, and the Publican*, S. Mat. 18. 18. *If any obey not our word, do not company with him, that he may be confounded*, 2 Theſ. 2. 14.

The

The *Minor* is proved, becauſe *Luther* and his fellow Proteſtants devided themſelves from the communion of all Churches, therefore from the communion of the Catholique Church, and that as well in poynts of doctrine, as matters of government, as plainly appears by all we have ſaid, and is yet confirmed, becauſe when they began their ſeparation, *Luther* in Germany, *Tyndall* in England &c. the Catholique Church was in moſt quiet poſſeſſion of her Tenets, in perfect peace and unity, her Doctrines and government being the very ſame they had been, not only to the time of *Gregory* the great (as Proteſtants confeſſe) but to the very time of the Apoſtles, as is manifeſt both by the publique Liturgies, Councels, and Records of all Ages, in which no one Doctrine of Faith, or ſubſtantiall point of Diſcipline, then profeſſed by the Roman Catholique Church, and oppoſed by Proteſtants, had ever been cenſured and condemned as heretical or ſchiſmaticall, but all for the moſt part actually deſigned and eſtabliſhed againſt antient hereticques, as you have ſeen in the Councils.

Fathers for this Point.

IN the 2. Age *Irenaus: God will judg thoſe who make ſchiſm in the Church, ambitious men, who have not the honor of God before their eyes, but rather*

ther imbracing their own intereſts then the unity of the Church, for ſmall and light cauſes divide the great and glorious Body of Chriſt, &c. for in the end they cannot make any reformation ſo important, as the evill of ſchiſm is prejudicious. l. 4 c 62.

In the third age S. *Cyprian: Do they think Chriſt is amongſt them when they are aſſembled out of the Church of Chriſt? No, though they were drawn to torments and execution for the confeſſion of the name of Chriſt, yet this pollution is not waſhed away, no not with blond; this inexpiable and inexcuſable crime of ſchiſm is not purged away even by death it ſelf.* De unit. Eccleſ.

In the fourth Age S. *Chryſoſtome; There is nothing ſo ſharply provokes the Wrath of God, as the diviſion of the Church, inſomuch that though we ſhould have performed all other ſorts of good things, yet we ſhall incur a puniſhment no leſs cruell, by dividing the unity of the Church, then thoſe have done, who pierced and divided Chriſts own Body.* In Epheſ. Hom. 11.

In the ſame Age *Optatus; The unity of the Epiſcopall Chair is the prime endowment of the Church.* L. 2.

In the fifth Age S. *Auguſtine; If any man be found ſeparated from her* (the Church) *he ſhall be excluded from the number of Children, neither ſhall he have God for his Father, that would not have the Church for his Mother: and it will nothing availe him to have rightly believed, or to*

have

have done never ſo many good Works without this concluſion of the ſoveraigne good, de Symbol. ad Catechum. l 4. c. 10. And again, *Whoſoever hath charity is aſſured, but as for charity, no man tranſporteth that out of the Church*, in Pſalm. 21. And in another place; *Out of the Church an Heretike may have all things but ſalvation; he may have the Sacraments, he may have the Faith and preach it, &c. only ſalvation he cannot have*, ſup. geſti Emar. And to the *Donatiſts* he ſayes, *You are with us in Baptiſm, in the Creed, and in the other Sacraments of the Lord, but in the ſpirit of unity, in the bond of peace, and finally in the Catholike Church you are not with us*, Epiſt. 48.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. WE ſeparated only from the Church of Rome's errors.

Anſw. Yes, from her Catholike and Apoſtolicall Doctrines: She doth not erre in Faith, as hath been proved. I anſwer therfore with S. *Auguſtine* to the *Donatiſts*; *I object to you the crime of ſchiſm, which you will deny, and I will preſently prove, becauſe you do not communicate with all nations*, cont. *Petil.* Add, no nor with any Nation before *Luther*.

Ob. We refus'd only the Church of Rome's innovations and ſuperſtitions.

Anſw.

Answ. You slander. Her Discipline and Doctrines were the same then, that they had been in all precedent ages. *Did the Church perish* (saith S. *Augustine* to the *Donatists*) *or did she not? If she did, what Church then brought forth the* Donatists? (or the Protestants?) *If she did not, what madness moved you to separate your selves from her, on pretence of avoiding the communion of bad men?* l. 1. cont. Gaudent. c. 7. And again; *We are certain no man can justly separate himself from the communion of all Nations*, (yet *Martin Luther* and Mr. *Tyndall* did it) Epist. 48. And in another place; *All separation made before the drawing the net on the shore* (at the day of judgment) *is damnable, and the sacriledge of schism, which surpasseth all other crimes.* l. 2. cont. Epist. Parmen.

Ob. We did but separate from the particular Church of Rome. Therefore not from the whole Church.

Answ. I told you in the question of the Churches Universality in what sense the Church of Rome is Universal or Catholique, and in what sense she is particular, take it in which acception you will, your consequence is false, for whosoever separates from an acknowledged true member of the Catholique Church (and such the Church of Rome then was in her particular) he consequently separates from the whole, and is an heretike, or schismatike.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE X.

Of the reall and substantiall presence of Christs Body & Bloud in the Sacrament of the B. Eucharist.

IN this most important controversie of the *B. Eucharist*, or *Sacrament* of our *Lords Supper*, our Tenet is;

Seeing it is ye Signe 'tis not ye thing signed. vid. Margin: p: 169; p: 368.

1. *That it is a Sacrament; a visible signe, type, figure, or symbol of the true Body and Blood of Iesus Christ, as also of his death and passion.* This is agreed upon by all, and therefore not to be disputed.

2. *That it is not an empty signe, type, figure, or symbol only* (as Sectaries pretend) *but also the very naturall and substantiall Body and Bloud of Iesus Christ, true God and Man, under the said outward signes and symbols of bread and wine;*

Which

Which we prove thus, againſt Doctor TAYLOR, and his adherents.

The firſt Argument.

We receive in the B. Sacrament of the Euchariſt the ſame Body which was given and broken for us, and the ſame blood which was ſhed for the remiſſion of our ſins.

But the body which was given, and broken for us, and the blond which was ſhed for the remiſſion of our ſins, was the true natural & ſubſtantial body & blood of Jeſus Chriſt, and not an empty ſign or ſymbol only of it.

Therefore we receive in the B. Sacrament of the Euchariſt, the true naturall and ſubſtantiall Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, and not an empty ſigne or ſymbol only of it.

The *major* is proved by the plaine words of the Inſtitution. *This is my Body*, S. Matth. 26.27. S. Mark 14.22. *This is my Body which is given for you*, S. Luke 22.19. *This is my Body which ſhall be delivered for you*, 1 Cor. 11.24. *This is my blood of the new Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for many to the remiſſion of ſins*, S. Mat. 26.28. S. Mark 14.24. *This is the chalice the new Teſtament in my blood which ſhall be ſhed for you*, S. Luke 22.20. *This chalice is the new Teſtament in my blood*, 1 Cor. 11.25.

The

The *minor* is proved; *Christ gave himself for his Church*, Ephes. 5. 26. *He entred by his own blood into the Holies*, *Heb.* 9. 12. To say Christ gave a fantasticall body for us, or shed any other then his true naturall Bloud for the remission of our sins, is the *Manichean Heresie*, long since condemned; nor is it less an Heresie to say, He gave only common bread, or shed only common wine, (being made sacred signes and symbols) for the remission of our sins.

A second Argument, proving that the words of Institution ought to be taken literally and properly.

All those plain texts of the Gospel, which are not there express'd to be figurative, and being literally and properly understood imply no sin or contradiction, ought to be understood literally and properly.

But these plain texts of the Gospel, *This is my body*, *this is my blood*, S. *Math.* 26. 27. 28. are not there express'd to be figurative, and being literally and properly understood, imply no sin or contradiction.

Therefore these Affirmative texts of Scripture, *This is my body*, *this is my blood*, ought to be understood literally and properly.

The *major* I take for a Rule admitted by Proteſtants and is proved, becauſe otherwiſe it were not poſſible to prove by Scripture, that any one text of the Goſpel ought to be taken literally and properly which our adverſaries cannot in their Principles allow.

The *minor* is alſo manifeſt for the firſt part, to whoſoever ſhall peruſe the text, there is no mention of any figure in it. And the ſecond part I prove thus; becauſe it was poſſible to Chriſt to verifie thoſe affirmatives in the literal and proper ſenſe of the words if he had ſo pleaſed, by changing the Bread and Wine into his own Body and Blood, as our very adverſaries themſelves grant, although they obſtinately conteſt he hath not done it; therefore theſe affirmatives, being literally and properly underſtood, imply no ſin or contradiction; for ſin and contradiction are not poſſible to Chriſt, who is by eſſence, Truth and Sanctity.

That our adverſaries grant this change poſſible to Chriſt, is proved by theſe inſuing teſtimonies.

Luther ſayes: *What proof hav they* (the Sacramentaries) *to prove theſe propoſitions contradictory; Chriſt is in heaven, and Chriſt is in the Supper? The contradiction is in their carnall imagination, not in faith, or in the Word of God,* Tom. Wittenberg. an. 1557. defenſ. verbi Cœnæ, pag. 388.

You

You hear where all Doctor *Taylors* pretended contradictions are, if *Martin Luther*, that first and greatest light of true Protestancy, be worthy to be judg.

John Calvin sayes, *We do not dispute what God can do, but what he will*, Init. Institut.

Jewell confesses, *God is able by his omnipotent power to make Christs Body present without place or quantity*, in his Reply against *Harding*, pag. 352.

Cranmer confesses, *That Christ may be in the bread and wine, as also in the doors that were shut, and stone of the sepulcher*, in his answer to *Gardner* and *Smith*, pag. 454.

Whitaker sayes, *That Christ can make the bread his Body we grant, only shew that he will do it, and the controversie is ended*, in his Answer to *Reyner*, pag. 192.

John Fox sayes, *That Christ abiding in heaven is not let, but that he may be in the Sacrament also.* Acts and Monum. pag. 998.

Melancthon sayes, *I had rather die, then affirm with the Zuinglians, that Christs Body can be but in one place.* Epist. ad Martinum Gerolitium.

Doctor *Taylor* himself sayes, *God can do what he pleases, he can change or annihilate every creature, and alter their manner and essence*; in his Book of the reall and spirituall presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, pag. 244. *He can indeed make a body to be a spirit*, pag. 213.

And again, *Let it appear that God hath affirmed Transubstantiation, and I for my part will burn all my arguments against it, and make publique amends*, pag. 240. Fairly promised, Doctor, I subsume.

But he hath plainly affirm'd the *reall* and *substantiall presence of his Body and Blood* in the Sacrament; as hath been proved both from the institution and possibility, and shall be proved from the performance, and reasonableness of it.

Therefore recall your arguments against it; together with that long impertinent catalogue of seeming contradictions, and impossibilities, which you have malitiously heap'd together &c. meerly to scandalize and turne the braine of an unlearned Reader. Your own friends, that are Scholars, have long since detected the nullity of them, and your own conscience tels you, that you have drawn them all from this *false supposition, That Christs Body hath situall and locall extension in the Sacrament*, which you know we deny; the manner of being is spiritual and Sacramental.

A second proof that those affirmatives, *This is my Body: This is my Blood*, imply no sin or contradiction, is made from the solution of your Objections.

A third Argument.

Ma. All which Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture, ought to be understood by us in the literal and proper sense of the words.

Mi. But Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture, that what he instituted at his last Supper, was his true natural Body and Bloud.

Conf. Therfore it ought to be understood by us in the literal and proper sense of the words.

The *major* is confest by Doctor *Taylor*, saying, *Let it appear that God hath expresly said it,* &c. *and there is no more to be said in the business, all reasons brought against it are but sophisms,* pag. 189. and for this onely reason he concludes, the *mystery of Christ God and Man, and the mystery of the Blessed Trinity ought to be understood in the literal and proper sense of the words, although more seeming contradictions and impossibilities are brought against it, then against Transubstantiation*, pag. 200, &c.

The *minor* is proved from the promise of Christ, thus.

Ma. The flesh which Christ give for the life of the world, was his true natural Body and Blood, in the literal and proper sense of the words.

Mi. But Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture, that what he instituted at his last Supper, was the flesh which he gave for the life of the world.

Conf. Therefore Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture, that what he instituted at his last Supper was his true and naturall Body and Blood, in the literal and proper sense of the words.

The *major* hath been proved above by all those texts cited in the first argument.

The *minor* is proved. *The bread which I will give* (at his last Supper) *is my flesh for the life of the world*, S. John 6.51.

Another Argument in proof of this verity.

Ma. The Body which Christ gave for us, and the Blood which he shed for the remission of our sins, was his true naturall Body and Blood, in the literal and proper sense of the words.

Mi. But Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture that what he instituted at his last Supper was the Body which he gave for us, and the Blood which he shed for the remission of our sins.

Conf. Therefore Christ hath plainly and expresly said in Scripture that what he instituted at his last Supper was his true naturall Body

Body and Blood in the literal and proper ſenſe of the words.

The *major* is manifeſt, and muſt be granted by all, unleſſe perhaps we may dare to ſay, that meer ſymbols, ſignes and figures only of his Body and Blood were given for us and ſhed for the remiſſion of our ſins, which God forbid.

The *minor* is proved, by the texts above cited, nor will it be tedious to repeat them, to the confuſion of our enemies.

This is my Body. This is my Blood which ſhall be ſhed for many unto the remiſſion of ſins, S. Mat. 26 27, 28. *This is my body which is given for you. This is the chalice the new Teſtament in my blood, which ſhall be ſhed for you*, S. Luke 22.20. *This is my Body which is broken for you*, (ſo the Greek text hath it.) *This chalice is the new Teſtament in my blood*, 1 Cor. 11.25. *Broken*, that is, *ſacrificed*, ſaith *John Calvin* and *Chamier* on that place.

Now let Doctor *Taylor* at his leiſure bring the *Antitheſis* of theſe Affirmatives out of the mouth of Chriſt, *viz. This is not my body: this is not my blood: this is not my body which is given for you: this is not my blood which is ſhed for you.*

Or theſe at leaſt, which are his very *Theſes*. *This only ſignifies my body: this only ſignifies*

my bloud: this is only a ſacred ſigne, type, or figure of my body: this is only a ſacred ſigne, type, or figure of my blood: which he can never do ſo long as Chriſt is Chriſt, and Goſpel Goſpel. Theſe are not the words of God, but the words of men, of Doctor *Taylor*, and *John Calvin*, what we aſſert is from the mouth of Chriſt, the Doctor is not able to deny it; but openly, to my beſt judgment, condemn'd himſelf, and his own cauſe, by making an ingenious confeſſion, that if the words of the inſtitution be taken literally and properly, they prove our Tenet, and therefore he indeavours to detort them to an improper figurative ſenſe. *This is*, (that is ſaith he) *This* ſignifies, this repreſents *my body*, what is this els but to confeſſe the Scripture, which is the only judg with him, to have given ſentence on our ſide, at leaſt in all the principal and eſſential places, that appertain to this controverſie? what ſhall become then of his ſpurious doctrine, which is ſupported only by the fancy of his and M. *Calvins* idle braine? the Church having long ſince condemn'd it. He is not able to produce one General Councel, or the conſent of any one whole age, or yet the ſentence of any antient Father not wreſted and depraved, for his *Apocripha, This only ſignifies my body: this only ſignifies my bloud: this is onely a ſacred ſigne, type, or figure of my body, &c.* But we can cite him many

ny for our *Canonical*; *This is my body: this is my bloud. This is my body which is given for you,* &c. *This is my bloud which is shed for you:* which being done, I think, *It is concluded, against the* Manichees.

Note here for your better understanding the precedent argument, as also the words of *consecration*, that the Pronoun *hoc*, or *this* (when it is made the *subject* of a Proposition, in which substance is predicated of substance, especially if the proposition be practicall, and make what it signifies, as here it does) signifies only substance indeterminately, till the *predicate* be also added, to determine it to this or that particular substance, according to that *Axiom* of Philosophie, *the subjects are such as they are permitted to be by their predicates*; this is the literall and proper acception of the word *hoc*, or *this*. The Jews have no prop word for signify, but generally expresse it by est.

Secondly, the verb *est*, or *is*, signifies in its literall and proper acception the reall *identity* of the *predicate* with the *subject*.

Lastly, the words *Corpus meum, my body*, or *Sanguis meus, my bloud*, spoken by Christ, or in the person of Christ, signifie in their literall and proper acception, the true *naturall body* and *bloud of Christ*.

By this you plainly understand the literall and proper sense of those words, *This is my body, this is my bloud*: that is to say, *This*

substance

ſubſtance contained under the ſpecies, or outward forme of bread, is my naturall body. This ſubſtance contained under the ſpecies or outward forme of wine is my naturall blood. This is that which we believe it to be; and this is that which Chriſt hath plainly and expreſly affirmed it to be, as hath been proved.

Quare. When is this change of the bread & wine into the *body* & *bloud* of Chriſt effected?

Anſwer. Immediately after the words of *conſecration* are completed, and by force of the words.

You reply. Doctor *Taylor* ſayes, *We cannot prove by any good reaſon, that thoſe words, This is my body, this is my bloud,* &c. are the eſſentiall words of *conſecration*, and efficient of the whole change, S. *Matth.* 26.

Anſw. Yes we can. Firſt, by the Churches authority, affirming it to be ſo. She is a competent Judge in the caſe (being the Miſtris of *Apoſtolicall traditions*) and better worthy our belief then D. *Taylor*.

Secondly, Becauſe generally ſpeaking in all miraculous and ſubſtantiall changes made by the Word of God, thoſe words onely are efficient of the change, which ſignifie the change, as appears in theſe inſtances. *Let the light be made, and the light was made: Let the firmament be made,* &c. *Young man I ſay to thee ariſe. I will, be thou healed,* &c. and many others. Now that

that these are the only words in S. *Matthew*, which signifie the substantiall and miraculous change made in the Sacrament, is proved thus; because the precedent words, *He took bread, blessed it, brake it & gave it to his Disciples*, are all indifferent to a substantial or accidental; to a miraculous or morall change, and therefore cannot signifie or cause the change there made, but are a disposition only to it; the following words, suppose it already made, therefore it is most consonant to reason as well as to authority, that these words only, should be essential to, and efficient of, such miraculous change, nor am I able easily to guess what good meaning the Doctor had in starting this difficulty, unlesse it were to let himselfe and all men loose to infidelity in this so holy and necessary a point; for if it be altogether uncertain what the true words of the form are, whether any of the Evangelists have delivered them to us or not; (as this Doctor insinuates pag: 67. 68. 69.) then is the Sacrament altogether uncertain. If the words of the institution subsist not, the thing instituted cannot subsist. If there be no true forme, there can be no true Sacrament; but it should seem he cares not, so he may prejudice the *Catholique Church*, though he ruine Christianity by doing it.

A

A fourth Argument from Reason.

To make the signes and figures of a thing more excellent & noble then the thing it self, is to detract from the wisdom and providence of the workman.

But Doctor *Taylor* makes the signes and figures of the Sacrament, more excellent and noble then the Sacrament it selfe.

Therefore he detracts from the wisdom and providence of the workman, that is to say of Christ himselfe, ordaining it.

The *major* is proved, because to make words more excellent and noble then conceipts or things; shadows, then substances; or the means more excellent and noble then the end, were a preposterous way of working, and contrary to the rule of true wisdom and providence.

The *minor* is proved, because, if the Sacrament were nothing but a sacred signe, type, or figure only of *Christs Body* and *Blood* (as Doctor *Taylor* teaches,) then the signes and figures of the old Law were more excellent and noble then it. The *Manna* for example, which was a signe or figure only of the Sacrament, would be more excellent & noble then the Sacrament it self, as having a more excellent manner of signifying, because that was made by Angels ministry, and had twelve special miracles upon record belonging to it, this hath no miracle

racle at all belonging to it in D. *Taylors* thredbare way, and is compoſed by the hands of ſinfull men. It is no miracle for ſignes to ſignifie. Again the *Paſchal Lambe* was a more timely type or figure of our Redeemer & his paſſion, fleſh of fleſh, blood of blood, killing of killing, and that Lamb without ſpot of our innocent Saviour, then is their conſecrated bread and wine, if it be only a meer ſigne or figure, as he pretends, but in our way the caſe is far different; it being the fountain of all grace and miracles, and far excelling the types and figures of it.

A fifth Argument from Reaſon.

What no rationall or prudent man would ever do, were great blaſphemy to charge Chriſt with doing.

But no rational or prudent man would ever ſeal or compleat his laſt will and teſtament with figurative, equivocal, and improper words.

Therfore it were great blaſphemy to charge Chriſt with doing it.

Therefore theſe words, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, with which Chriſt ſealed and compleated his laſt will and teſtament, are not figurative, equivocal, and improper, but to be taken in the literall, plain and proper ſenſe, and

and consequently convince the reall presence of Christs true natural Body and Blood under the signes.

The *major* is more manifest then to need proofe.

The *minor* is proved, because that were a certain way to set his posterity at variance about it, which no rational or prudent man would ever willingly be guilty of.

You will tell me here perhaps to make all whole againe, that *Doctor Taylor* asserts the *real spirituall presence of Christs Body and Blood in the Sacrament pag.* 7. Nay that his *Body* and *Blood are there really, substantially, corporally, virily and indeed, pag.* 18. *That body which was broken, that Blood which was powred forth, page* 19. *That Body that was crucified the same do we eat. ibidem.* So far we all agree.

Answ. Stay, friend, not too much of agreement neither, that he affects those words I am not ignorant, but how he asserts the thing signified by the words, let difinterested Christians judge. He affirms *Christs Body to be really present*, but denies the *reality of his body to be present*, is not this, to be his reall Body and not to be his reall Body? to be really present, and not to be really present? He sayes. *It is substantially present in the signes*, and consequently in the mouths of the receivers. (*He cites the Church of Englands Catechisme for it, pag.* 8.) and yet the

substance

ſubſtance of his *Body* is neither in the ſignes nor in their mouths, no neerer then the right hand of the Father in the emperial heaven. Is not this againe to be the ſubſtance of his Body, and not to be the ſubſtance of his Body? to be ſubſtantially in the ſignes, and not to be ſubſtantially in the ſignes? *His true body*, he aſſures you, *that which was given, broken, and crucified for us, is in the Sacrament corporally, verily, and indeed, and yet indeed his true body neither is nor can be there at all.* It is in every conſecrated Hoſt, which are as many as there be Comunicants, and that *really, ſubſtantially, corporally, verily, and indeed*; and yet the *reality, ſubſtance, and verity of his body cannot be in two places at once, no not by Gods omnipotency*, without a multitude of contradictions and grand impoſſibilities; he can demonſtrate it as he thinks, to common ſenſe, and reaſon. If this be not to be, and not to be in many places at once, according to the ſame ſubſtance, reality, and entity; then ſenſe is nonſenſe, and reaſon ſtupidity. If this be not a gin to catch woodcocks for the Devil, then the Devil never went a birding. If this I ſay, be not a liſt of groſſer contradictions and impoſſibilities (how ever ſmoothly patched together) then all thoſe ſeeming ones wherewith he chargeth us, then white is black, and good evil, then to be, and not to be, (although affirmed of the ſame thing, in reſpect

of

of the same thing, and at the same time) are not contradictory.

Ob. You do not distinguish, betwixt the being of a thing, and the manner of its being.

Answ. Yes I do; but your Doctor will not understand, that any real manner of being, which a body hath, must of necessity presuppose the real being or entity of the said body. A thing cannot be there after any real manner, where its real being or entity is not, for *Peter* to be in any place sitting or standing, in a corruptible or incorruptible manner of being, must of necessity presuppose the real being, or entity of *Peter* in that place. So Christs body cannot be said to be really, where the real being or entity of his body is not, nor substantially or in a substantial manner, where the substantial being, or entity of his body, is not &c. no nor yet spiritually, without abuse of termes, because to be any where, even spiritually, or in a spiritual manner, without dependence on the understanding (as Christs body is in the Sacrament) must of necessity presuppose, the real being, or entity of the thing, there. A mans Soul is in his body spiritually, or in a spiritual manner of being, yet can it not be said to be so there, longer then the real being, or entity of his Soul is in his body; If that be driven thence by death, neither any real signe of it, as heat, motion &c. nor your beliveing it to

be

be there, (or all the friends he hath) can make it to be really and truly there.

You reply, the Doctor affirmes *Christs body to be in the Sacrament, really, ſubſtantially, corporally &c. as in a ſigne, figure, or ſymbol only.*

Anſw. He does indeed, by which he very groſly abuſes termes, and contradicts his own affirmatives in the very ſtate of the queſtion, becauſe by this he affirmes it to be there no more, then a But of Sack is in a buſh of Jvy at the Taverne door, or the Kings head in the Picture on the ſign-Poſt, theſe are ſigns, figures, or ſymboles of Sack and the Kings head, yet who ever ſhould ſeriouſly and obſtinatly affirme, that a But of Sack is really, ſubſtantially, corporally, and verily in the Jvy buſh, or the Kings head in the Picture on the ſigne poſt, would worthily be eſteemed to have more Sack then reaſon in his head, and not much more braines, then the head upon the ſigne Poſt, yet *D. Taylor affirmes the Sacrament to be the body and blood of Chriſt, really, ſubſtantially, corporally, &c.* although it be but *a meere ſacred ſigne or figure of it*, according to his doctrine, and this muſt paſſe for ſound and ſober Chriſtian doctrine, but not with any ſound, or ſober Chriſtians.

You reply yet, that when he calls the *Sacrament* the *body and blood of Chriſt really, ſubſtantially, and corporally*, his meaning only is,

That it is a real, ſubſtantial, and corporal ſigne of his body and blood, as he himſelfe expounds it; and therefore may be called his *body* and *blood*. The ſigne in Scripture is ſomtimes called by the name of the thing ſignified. So the *Rock* is called *Chriſt*. *And the Rock was Chriſt*.

Anſw. This is ſtill a very Juggle, an implicatory abuſe of termes. The Sacrament as it is a ſigne, figure, or ſymbol preciſely, is not a real, corporal, or ſubſtantial, but only a moral or artificial entity, made by the impoſition and agreement of reaſon, the whole reality, body and ſubſtance of bread was preſuppoſed to it, and nothing was added by its being made a ſigne, but only a relation or order of reaſon. So that an artificial corporal ſigne is ſomthing like a ſubſtantial ſhadow; that is to ſay, a body without body; a ſubſtance without ſubſtance, a contradiction. His meaning therefore is, if he dare ſpeak it, that it is real and ſubſtantial bread and wine, and a ſigne only, an artificial ſigne of the true body and blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which is notoriouſly falſe, as hath and ſhall be proved, for after conſecration it is no longer real and ſubſtantial bread and wine, but the real and ſubſtantial body and blood of Chriſt, under the outward formes of bread and wine, and in this ſenſe it may be truly cal'd the body and blood of *Chriſt, really, ſubſtantially, corporally, verily and indeed*; but not

not in Doctor *Taylors* chymerical way.

To his inſtance out of Scripture, *I Anſwer*, that the ſigne may be, and is ſomtimes called by the name of the thing ſignified, but not with ſuch abuſive attributes, as he makes uſe of. So the *Rock* is called *Chriſt*, but not *really, ſubſtantially, corporally, verily and indeed*, as he cals bread the body of *Chriſt*, nor was it ever ſo expounded by the Church, but figuratively, and typically only.

Ob. The true body of Chriſt is therein effect, that is in order to al the effects and purpoſes of his death & paſſion, which is enough to verifie his words.

Anſw. It is not; for ſo a counter is a pound of mony, when it ſtands for a pound on a table of Arithmetick; So a mans writings are his Lands in effect, that is, in order to effects and purpoſes, yet no man well in his wits will ever ſay a counter is a pound of mony, or a mans writings his Lands, *really, ſubſtantially, corporally, verily and indeed*, theſe are as wild expreſſions as the former; cauſes are not their own effects, nor effects, cauſes, as every young Logician can tell you. Nor is there any warrant in all the Goſpell, that a meere ſigne, type or figure of Chriſts body and blood, ſhould be his body in effect, or avaliable to us in order to all the benefits and effects of his paſſion, this is only *gratis* ſaid by the *Doctor*.

Ob. You urge yet out of *S. Paul*, that in

Christ all the fulnesse of the divinity is said to dwel corporally. Therefore *Christs body*, and *blood* may be said to be *substantially and corporally in the Sacrament, signe, or figure only of his body and bloud.*

Answ. I deny your consequence; the disparity is, 1. That all the substance, and essence of the Divinity is really and truly in Christ; whereas the substance and essence of the Body and Bloud of Christ is not at all in the Sacrament, signe or figure, according to your doctrine. 2. That all the substance and essence of the Divinity is in Christ hypostatically united in one person with his humane nature, which consists of a reall body and soul, and therefore by reason of that union of the natures, and communication of their properties, the Divinity may be truly said to dwell in him corporally. But there is no such union of natures, or communication of properties, betwixt Doctor *Taylors Sacrament*, and the Body and Bloud of Christ: Therefore this instance comes not home to the purpose.

Your last shift is (and this no better then the former) to tell us, *That the body of Christ is only in the Sacrament, really spiritually, substantially spiritually, corporally spiritually*, that is (sayes he) *the reality, substance, and body of Christ is in the Sacrament in the receivers spirit, by vertue of an act of faith, by which he believes it to be there.*

Answ.

Anſw. You ſtill dance in the ſame net of contradictions. No act of faith in the receiver can make the *reality, ſubſtance, and veritie of Chriſts bodie and blond to be there truly preſent, where it implies contradictions to be preſent*, as you affirm it does in the Sacrament. If you believe it to be *ſubſtantially* and *corporally*, where it is impoſſible for his *ſubſtance* and *bodie* to be, you feed your ſoul with a falſe faith. Where is it revealed to us in the Goſpel, that Chriſts body is in the Sacrament by faith only? What Apoſtolical Tradition have you for it? or in what country did our Saviour teach it? The chapter and verſe could never yet be cited nor ever will; the land is yet unknown; 'tis a meer fiction: take but off the mask from theſe abuſive terms, which was firſt made by *John Calvin* at Geneva, but lately furbuſht up by D. *Taylor*, to carry on the diſguize, and you will clearly ſee the nakedneſs of his mock-Sacrament, by the bright-ſhining lamp of thoſe plain words; *This is my bodie; this is my blond of the new teſtament, which is ſhed for many to the remiſſion of ſins, S. Matth.* 26. 27, 28. The whole coat, or rather cloak, which he hath made for this divine and holy Body; or to ſay better; for his own deceiptful hereſie, is better in the trimming, then the ſtuffe, which argues him to be but a fallacious & ſuperficial workman. Nor has he made it after the true Pro-

teſtant, but rather after the true Presbyter cut. Biſhop *Andrewes* hath given his Prelatique Proteſtants a much better meaſure of the reall preſence, but yet not true in all things neither.

The reſt of your eloquent and learned *Taylors* Arguments you ſhall find unſtitcht in the ſolution of Objections; Pardon this freedom of expreſſion; for I truly love his perſon, though unknown, and honor his great literature, looking on him as the very *Hector* of his Party, and doubtleſs,

——— *Si Pergama dextra*
Defendi poſſent, etiam hac defenſa fuiſſent.

Nothing but the badneſs of ſo ill a cauſe could have diſparaged him. Nevertheleſs, I cannot chuſe but hate & ſlight his Doctrines, as a meer idle dream, diſhonorable to God, and his Church, & deſtructive to poor ignorant ſouls. But all this only *obiter*, and by occaſion as it relates to D. *Taylor*.

My deſigne was not in this Work to oppoſe any man in particular, but to eſtabliſh Catholike verities, and impugne hereſies in generall, by drawing a compendious ſum of both. Leaving him therefore to his more learned Adverſaries, (the Diſciples of renowned *Bellarmine*) whom he by name hath challenged into the liſts; I now purſue my Method.

Fathers

Fathers for the reall and ſubſtantiall preſence of Chriſts Body and Bloud in the Sacrament.

In the ſecond Age *Juſtin Martyr*; *As Jeſus Chriſt incarnate had fleſh and bloud for our ſalvation, ſo are we taught, that the Euchariſt is the fleſh and bloud of the ſame Jeſus incarnate.* Apolog. 2. ad Antoninum.

In the third Age S. *Cyprian*; *The bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, being changed not in ſhape, but in nature, by the omnipotencie of the Word is made fleſh.* Serm. de Cœna Dom.

In the ſame Age *Origen*; *Then* (in the old Law) *the Manna was meat in an* Ænigma, *but now the fleſh of God is meat* in ſpecie, *as himſelf ſayes, My fleſh is meat indeed.* Homil. 7. in Levit.

In the ſame Age *Tertullian*; *The bread taken and diſtributed to his Diſciples he made his bodie.* l. 4. cont. Marcion. c. 40.

In the fourth Age S. *Ambroſe*; *Before it be conſecrated it is but bread, but when the words of conſecration come it is the bodie of Chriſt.* l. 4. de Sacrament. c. 5.

In the ſame Age *Optatus Melevitanus*; *What elſe is the altar but the ſeat of Chriſts bodie? You have broken the chalices, the bearers of Chriſts bloud.* 6. cont. Parmen.

In the ſame Age S. *Gregorie Nyſſen*; *We truly believe, even by the Word of God, that the ſanctified bread is changed into the bodie of God the Word.* Orat. Catechiſ. c. 37.

In the ſame Age S. *Chryſoſtome*; *He that ſits above with his Father, even in the ſame inſtant of time is touch'd by the hands of all, and gives himſelf to all ſuch as are willing to receive him,* &c. *Whereas Chriſt leaving his fleſh to us, yet aſcending to heaven, there alſo he hath it.* L. de Sacerdotio.

In the fifth Age S. *Auguſtine*; *How* David *could be carried in his own hands We find not, but in Chriſt We do, for he was carried in his own hands, when, giving his bodie, he ſaid,* This is my body: *For then he carried that bodie in his own hands.* In Pſalm. 33. concione 1.

The firſt Nicene Council has defined, *the Lamb of God to be placed on the ſacred table, and to be ſacrificed unbloudily by the Prieſts, and that receiving his ſacred Bodie and Bloud, We muſt believe them to be ſignes of our reſurrection.* l. 3. Decret. de divina menſa, an. 325.

It defined alſo, *that Deacons who have no power to offer ſacrifice, ought not to give the Bodie and Bloud of Chriſt to Prieſts who have that power.* Can. 14. The Councils above cited will ſhew you more.

Objections

Objections from Scripture ſolved.

Ob. The pronoune *hoc*, or *this*, in that propoſition, *This is my body*, ſignifies determinately bread, and therefore cannot but make a figurative propoſition, for bread is not the *body* of *Chriſt*.

Anſw. I deny your antecedent, it ſignifies of it ſelfe only ſubſtance, without determinating either bread or body till it be determined by the words following, to ſignifie and be the *body* of *Chriſt*, the *ſubject* of my propoſition is ſuch as it is permitted to be by the *predicate*. For example, when I ſay, this, or this is, as yet the word (*this*) ſignifies nothing determinately, but when I ſay, *this is paper*, *this is ink*, *this is a good hand*; now it is determinated to ſignifie, *paper*, *ink*, *a good hand*; and not till now, wherefore your conſequence is alſo falſe, *Chriſt* did not ſay, *this bread is my bodie*, but, *this* (that is the ſubſtance contain'd under theſe accidents) *is my bodie*, which is true in the literal and proper ſenſe of the words.

Ob. If the word *hoc*, or *this*, do not ſignifie, and demonſtrate bread, the propoſition is identicall, and nugatory, and ſignifies no more, then my body is my body, *ergo*.

Anſw. I deny your antecedent, there is an accidental difference betwixt the *ſubject* and the

the *predicate* in the manner of ſignifying, which ſufficeth to a formal predication.

Ob. The pronoune demonſtrative *hoc*, or *this*, muſt needs demonſtrate ſomthing then preſent, when it is uttered, *ergo.*

Anſw. I deny your antecedent, ſpeaking of any determinate thing, things paſt, and to come, may be demonſtrated as well as things preſent; for example, *This is my commandement, that you love one another*, *Ioan.* 15. there, *this*, demonſtrats a thing to come; So likewiſe in our caſe the demonſtrative *this*, when all the words are uttered, demonſtrates the *bodie of Chriſt* which is made by the words; if you will not credit me, believe *Chamier* a grand *Sacramentarian, it is falſe* (ſaies he) *even in the pronoune or adverbe demonſtrative, that a preſent thing is required, for that is not alwaies*, l. 10. de Euchariſt. c. 18.

Ob. Thoſe words of *S. Luke*, 22. 20. *This is the chalice, the new teſtament in my blood, &c. which* (*chalice*) *ſhall be ſhed for you*, cannot be literal but figurative, *ergo.*

Anſw. We deny not all figures in the myſtery, but only ſuch as exclude the verity of *Chriſts* true and natural *bodie* and *blood*; there is a figure in the word, *chalice*, not excluding but aſſerting the verity of our Saviours true, and natural *blood*; It is the thing containing for the thing contained, and ought to be expounded

pounded by the words of *S. Matthew*, which are plaine, literal, and proper, according to that generally received rule; That hard and figurative places of Scripture are to be expounded by plain and easie ones. Add to this, that the thing signified to be shed is evidently the same in both, to wit the true and natural *blood* of *Christ*, though the manner of expressing it be divers, literal in *S. Matthew*, and figurative in *S. Luke*. So when we say, *I drink sack*, and *I drink a cup of sack or in sack*, the thing signified to be drunk, is evidently the same in both, to wit *sack*, though the manner of signifying it be divers.

Ob. The Sacrament, after consecration, is some times called bread. Therefore it is bread still.

Answ. I grant your antecedent, but deny your consequence. It is sometimes called bread, because it was made of bread, and still retaines the outward forme of bread, though it be now the body of Christ. So *Eve* when she was now a woman is call'd a *Bone*, *Genes.* 2. because God made her of a Rib of *Adam*. And so a *Serpent* is called a *Rod*, because it was made of a *Rod*. *Aarons Rod eat up all the Magicians Rods*, *Exod.* 7.

Ob. It is the spirit, that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, *Jo.* 6. Therefore Christ did not

not give his flesh in the Sacrament.

Answ. I distinguish your antecedent, *The flesh profits nothing*, given or eaten in a fleshly and corporal manner, or in dead morsels, as the *Capharnaites* grosly understood he meant to give it them, I grant; Given or eaten in a spiritual and Sacramental manner, as *Christ* gave it his disciples and we eat it, I deny; let *S. Augustine* expound this text; *O my good master* (saith he) *how doth the flesh profit nothing seing thou saiest, unlesse one shall eat my flesh and drink my blood he shall have no life in him, doth life profit nothing?* &c. *what is this then, it profits nothing, but as they understood it, for they so understood flesh as it is borne in the carkasse, or sold in the shambles, not as it is quickned with the spirit.* Thus he on this very place. And againe, *They thought our Lord would cut certaine pieces of his body and give it them, and they said, this is a hard speech; but they themselves were hard, not the speech, &c. in Psalm. 98.*

Ob. The Sacrament is a *memorial* or *memory* of *Christ*, *do this for a commemoration of me*, *S. Lu:* 22. 19. Therefore *Christ is* not really present in it, for memory or commemoration is made of things absent, not present.

Answ. What *Christ* would have us commemorate *S. Paul* hath taught us, saying: *As often as ye shall eat this bread and drink the chalice ye shall declare the death of our Lord vntill he come,*

come, 1. *Cor*: 11. 26. wherefore, granting your antecedent, I deny your conſequence, his death is now 1600. yeats ſince and upward; and the ſame thing in one time or circumſtance may be a repreſentation or memory of it ſelfe, as in another. His *body* as unbloodily offer'd in the Sacrament, is a *memory* of it ſelfe as bloodily offer'd and dying on the *Croſſe*.

Ob. His death was future and to come when he ordain'd the Sacrament at his laſt Supper. Therefore it could not then be a memory of his death.

Anſw. I grant your whole argument, the words, *Do this for a commemoration of me*, immediately follow the words of *Conſecration*, and make this ſenſe, conſecrate ye bread and wine into my *bodie* and *blood*, as I have here done, in memory of my death; now 'tis certaine, he did not command his Apoſtles to conſecrate *then*, nor did they ever do it till after his death though he then ordain'd the ſacrifice, and gave them power to do it. The Sacrament is not only a memory of his death, but alſo of his life, and in this ſenſe, thoſe words might be fulfilled at the laſt Supper.

Ob. Chriſt calls the cup *the fruit of the vine*, therefore it is common wine, and not his blood.

Anſw. I grant your antecedent, but deny your conſequence. for the words, *I will drink*

no

no more of the fruit of the vine, S. *Lu.* 22. 18. relate to the *legal cup*, and are ſet immediatly after the diviſion of that, before the *Sacramental cup* was conſeerated, and therefore plainly prove the *ſacramental cup* not to be the fruit of any earthly vine. If you reply, that in S. *Matthew* they relate to the *ſacramental cup*, and are ſet immediately after the diviſion of it. I ſay, *by the fruit of the vine*, is there ſignified a celeſtiall fruit, and of a heavenly vine; *Such as was to be drunk by them in the kingdom of his Father*, there is no Vintners wine, nor are you ignorant who ſaid, *I am the vine.*

Ob. He that eats my fleſh hath life everlaſting, S. *Jo.* 6. 54. Therefore the reprobate, according to your ſenſe, ſhall have life everlaſting, for they eat his fleſh in your opinion.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh your antecedent; *He that eats it* worthily, that is, with worthy preparation, I grant. *He that eats it* unworthily, as the wicked do, I deny your antecedent, and conſequence alſo; 'tis the Apoſtles own diſtinction, *For he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himſelf*, 1. *Cor*, 11. 28.

Ob. Not as your Fathers did eat Manna and died, he that eateth this bread ſhall live for ever. S. *Jo.* 6. 58. Therefore no man can eat the bread there ſpoken of unworthily, otherwaies there would be no difference betwixt it and the

the *Manna*, for ſuch as eat the *Manna* worthily had life everlaſting.

Anſw. The diſparity is evident, and conſiſts in this, that the principal effect of the *Manna*, as ſacramental, was but a temporal nouriſhment towards arriving to the land of Promiſe, even in thoſe who took it worthily, whereas the *B. Sacrament* of the *Euchariſt* really contains and exhibits the grace it ſignifies in order to eternal life: beſides the words *mortui ſunt*, import not onely a bare temporal death, but ſuch as imply'd an excluſion from ever ſetting foot on the land of promiſe.

Ob. Chriſt affirmed bread to be his Body.

Anſw. No; he affirmed that which had been bread to be changed into his Body.

Ob. What Chriſt took, he gave; But he took bread into his hands &c. Therefore he gave bread.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh your *major*: What he took, he gave; unchanged, or in the ſame manner he took it. I denie: What he took he gave changed, and made his Body, I grant: and ſo agreeing he took bread, I deny your conſequence: It is as fallacious as to ſay, What I bought, I eat; but I bought raw fleſh, Therefore I eat raw fleſh. The kitchen-boy will tell you where the fallacie lies.

Ob. The Sacrament is as plainly affirm'd to be bread, and that three ſeverall times in one

Epiſtle,

Epiſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10, 11. as 'tis affirm'd to be the Body of Chriſt in the three Goſpells. Therefore the balance is equall in reſpect of Scripture. *Ergo.*

Anſw. You will play at ſmall game, rather then not be fencing againſt the truth; if this were ſo as you pretend, then nothing at all could ever be proved touching this point, according to your grounds, who will admit no other Judge or Rule then Scripture only; and ſo the myſtery were quite deſtroid, and brought to a *non liquet*; but your antecedent is falſe, for though *S. Paul* thrice calls it *Bread*, yet he no where determines it to be natural or earthly bread, but the contrary. *The bread* (ſaith he) *which We break, is it not the participation of the body of our Lord?* 1. *Cor.* 10. 16. *Let a man prove himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup; for he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks Judgment to himſelf, not diſcerning the body of our Lord. v.* 28. 29.

Naturall and common bread is not a participation of the body of Chriſt, it requires no ſuch examin of our ſelves to a worthy eating of it, nor can we be damned for not diſcerning the *Body* of our Lord in it, where it is not. So that the very circumſtance of the text, determines the bread there ſpoken of to be that *Heavenly bread* promiſ'd in the ſixt of S. *John*. That bread which *Paul* tells you *Chriſt* took and

and made his body, saying, *This is my body which shall be delivered for you, in the same*, *c. v.* 24. Therefore the balance is far from being equall; where the dispute is, what it is *Christ* instituted; no other places whatsoever can counterbalance those of the institution, 'tis partial, and irrational, to say they can.

Ob Christ saies, *This is my body which is broken for you* (so *the Greek text runs*) 1. *Cor.* 11. Therefore he did not give his true natural *Body* in the Sacrament, because that would not be there naturally broken:

Answ. I grant your antecedent, but deny your consequence; and for proofe I answer, that though his natural body be there, yet the manner of its being is spiritual & sacramental, and the manner of its breaking follows the manner of its being. The Sacrament is broken naturally and properly, according to the species or accidents of bread, but the *body* of *Christ* contained under them is broken only by accident, improperly, and sacramentally. His body is there broken in the signe, not in the substance, and this sufficeth to represent and signifie its natural and proper breaking on the Cross.

Ob. Our Fathers did all eat the same spiritual food and drunk the same spiritual drink, 1. *Cor.* 10. 3. and *S. Austin* saies, *as the Fathers did eat Christs body, so do we under a divers Sacrament, tract.* 26. *In Johan.* But they only eat and drunk

a figure of his *Body* and *Blood*, not the very thing it ſelf. Therfore we eat & drink no more.

Anſw. The Apoſtle ſpeaks there only of the *Jews*, and ſaies, they compar'd among themſelves, *did all eat of one bread, and drink of one rock*, which was a figure of *Chriſt*, he does not ſay they all eat the ſame ſpirituall meat, or drunk the ſame ſprituall drink with us (as your objection would pretend) there is no ſuch word in the text. That which we eat and drink was not inſtituted in their days. They eat and drunk the figures and effects only, we the things figured. *The law had but a figure of the good things to come, not the very image of things. Heb.* 10. 1. boggle not at the word, *image*, for 'tis the proper title of *Chriſt, who is the image of God*, 2. *Cor.* 4 4. It excludes not the verity of his divine, or humane nature. He is the *very image of God* in both, the grand *image* or *Word, by which all things were made. S. Jo.* 1. beſides, *all things happened to them in a figure, but to us in verity*. To *S. Auguſtines* words, I Anſwer, they infer but a ſimilitude, not an identity betwixt the Fathers and our eatnig *Chriſts body*: They eat it in effect, by eating the figure only, we eat it in the verity of the thing it ſelfe, by eating both the figure, and the thing figured; wherefore, granting your *minor*, I deny your *conſequence*. Beſides *S. Auſtin* expreſly names *divers* Sacraments, though both ſeem bread, ſo

that

that his meaning concludes ſomewhat more then bread in our Sacrament.

Ob. Whatſoever entereth into the mouth goeth into the belly and is caſt forth into the draught, S. *Math.* 15.17. Therefore the Sacrament is not the true *body* of *Chriſt*, but only a figure of it.

Anſw. Chriſt ſpeaks there only of what goes into the mouth after a viſible and corporeal manner, which renders the conſequence abſurd; His body in the Sacrament hath an inviſible and Spirituall manner of being, and is not ſubject to any intrinſecal alteration, and therefore cannot be changed into *draught*, as you impiouſly imagine, and if it could be ſent forth that way in ſome poſſible caſe, that would not prejudice the dignity of his perſon, or *reality* of his *preſence* in the *Sacrament*, no more then did the old Heathens blaſphemous ſuppoſitions of his being eaten by a Beare, or ſome other wild beaſt, by which they ſought to infirme the verity of his *Incarnation*; as you do of his *real preſence*: but all in vaine.

Ob. Unleſſe I goe hence the Comforter ſhall not come unto you, S. Jo. 16. 7. *The poore yon have alwaies with you, but me yon have not alwaies. S. Math.* 26.11.

Anſw. He ſpeaks there only of his withdrawing his corporeal, and viſible preſence from his Church, which hinders not, but that he may be alwaies with her in a ſpiritual, inviſible & ſacramental manner. M 2 *Ob.*

not corporeal.

Ob. We read the verb *is*, often put for *ſignifies* in holy Scripture, as appears by all theſe places. *The ſeed is the Word, the field is the world; the rock is Chriſt, I am the doore, I am the vine, my Father is the husbandman, I am the way; Sara and Agar are the two teſtaments &c.* Therefore *is* in this propoſition, *This is my body*, may well be taken, for ſignifies.

Anſw. I grant your anteeedent, but deny your conſequence, the diſparity is, that in all thoſe inſtances brought for proof of your anteeedent, different and diſparate natures are affirmed of one another, which cannot be identified, and therefore muſt of neceſſity be figuratively underſtood, or elſe the propoſitions will be falſe; But when *Chriſt* ſaid *This is my body*, he did not affirme one diſparate of another, as hath been proved, the ſubſtance contained under thoſe accidents, and ſignified by the word, *this*, is really identified, and the ſame thing with his *body*, and therefore may, and ought to be underſtood in the literal and proper ſenſe of the words.

But as we look nearer upon the places, we ſhall diſcern in the firſt examples an evident explication of a parable, in the later property and *ſignifying*, for the ſenſe is not, I ſignifie a vine, or a doore, &c. but *I truly am the vine of life, doore of heaven* &c. and the laſt of all is purely an interpretation of an Allegory.

Ob.

Objections out of Fathers ſolved.

Ob. TErtullian ſaies on thoſe words, *The fleſh profits nothing*, *S.Jo.* 6. that is, *it profits nothing to give life*, de reſurrect.car.*c.*37.

Anſw. His meaning only is, *that it profits nothing, if receiv'd without faith and preparation, but if eaten worthily*, ſo it profits much. *He that eateth my fleſh hath life everlaſting*, *S.Jo.* 6.54. *Tertullian* denies not this, much leſſe doth he deny it, to be *Chriſts* true fleſh.

Ob. S.Athanaſius ſaies, *the things that he ſpeaks are not carnal, but ſpiritual, for to how many might his body ſuffice for meat &c?*

Anſw. The manner of their being is not carnal but ſpiritual, we grant, and this is all he intends, which excludes not the reality, and true ſubſtance of his *body* and *blood* from being there. And though *Chriſts body*, if eaten in a carnal and bodily manner, like other common meats, could ſuffice but to a few for food, yet eaten in a ſpiritual and ſacramental manner, it may and does ſuffice for all the faithfull.

Ob. Origen ſaies, *if we underſtand thoſe words, unleſſe ye eat the fleſh of the Son of man, &c, Jo.*6. *literally the letter kills*, in Levit. cap. 10. Homil.7.

Anſw. If we underſtand it literally touching the manner of being or eating which the fleſh

eaten hath in the Sacrament, *it kills*, true; for that is ſpirituall, and ſacramental. If we underſtand it literally, touching the verity and ſubſtance of the fleſh eaten, I deny it kills; nor doth he affirme it. So it gives life, as hath been proved.

Ob. Origen in c. 5. Math. ſaies, *that the Sacrament, according to that which it hath material, is caſt forth into the draught*, ergo.

Anſw. By *that which it hath material*, he means only the outward formes, or accidents of bread, which is not againſt us. If you reply, the accidents of bread cannot be changed into our ſubſtance or nouriſh us. Therefore it can not be *Origens* meaning, that they only are caſt forth into the draught. I deny your antecedent, becauſe the accidents of bread have ſtill the ſame nature they had before, & therfore as they could naturally be corrupted & changed into our nouriſhment, whilſt they were in the ſubſtance, ſo likwiſe they may now, & becauſe the quantity hath by force of the miracle of conſecration obtained the property of ſubſtance, by being it ſelfe without a ſubject, and made the ſubject of all the other accidents, it may now be changed both into ſubſtance and quantity: or how can you prove, but he, who miraculouſly changed the ſubſtance of the bread into his own body, doth alſo miraculouſly, at the inſtant when the accidents are chang'd,

Papa! Accident & Subſtance the ſame!

chang'd, supply substance againe to them, by means whereof, the mutation, and nutrition, may be natural?

Ob. S. Augustine saies, *the Sacrament is after a manner the body and blood of Christ*, Epist. 23.

Answ. That is after a spiritual, and sacramental manner, (yet reall and substantiall) not after a visible, corporeal, or carnal manner. So he saies, *that place*, (*unlesse ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood &c,*) *seems to command a horrible crime* (*l. de doct. Christ. c.*26) *viz.* If we understand it to be eaten in a visible and carnal manner as we eat other common flesh, but we understand it not so, as you have oft been told. And for the verity of the thing done, *S. Augustine* is clearly on our side. *We receive* (saies he) *with faithfull heart and mouth* (mark the word mouth) *the Mediator of God and men, man Christ Jesus, giving us his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk, though it seem more horrible to eat mans flesh then to kill, and to drink mans blood* (viz. in a visible and carnal manner) *then to shed it*, *l.*2. cont. adversar. leg. &. Prophet. c.9. and it is to be observ'd, that *S. Aug.* in explicating this Sacrament often applies his speech to the Church, the mistical body of Christ.

A Body & not having a corporeal presence

Ob. S. Augustine brings in *Christ* himselfe saying, *That which I have spoken, understand ye spiritually, you shall not eat this body which you see,*

I have commended a Sacrament to you, which being ſpiritually underſtood will give you life, in Pſal. 98.

Anſw. By *this body which you ſee*, He underſtands his viſible body, or his body in a viſible manner of being, that he affirms they were not to eat, and ſo do we; but the ſame body being in a ſpiritual and inviſible manner in the Sacrament they were to eat. *Chriſt* had commanded it. *Take, eat, this is my body*, ſo it is ſaid, *that fleſh and blood ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is, fleſh and blood in the ſtate of corruption and mortality ſhall not, but the ſame fleſh and blood, having put on incorruption, and inmortality, ſhall.

Ob. S. Auguſtine ſaies, *he that diſagrees from Chriſt* (viz. by ſin) *neither eats his fleſh, nor drinks his blood, though to his own damnation he dayly receive the Sacrament of ſo great a thing*, cited by *S. Proſp. Sent.* 339. Therefore the *body* of *Chriſt* is not really and ſubſtantially in the Sacrament, but by faith only and to the worthy receiver.

Anſw. S. Auguſtine means only, that ſuch an one doth not eat his fleſh or drink his blood effectually, that is, in order to the effects of grace and life, as worthy receivers do, not that his fleſh and blood are not really and orally received by him.

Ob. S. Auguſtine and Ribera ſay *that the ſigne or figure is wont ſomtimes in Scripture to be called by the name of the thing ſignified or figured.* There-

fore

fore though the Sacrament be call'd the *body* of *Christ*, it is not really his *body*, but a ſigne or figure only of it.

Anſw. I admit your antecedent, and in this they ſay no more, then that ſome places in Scripture are figurative, which we willingly grant, but not all, where fore I deny your conſequence, the inſtances they being are all plainly figurative.

Ob. The *Fathers* often call the *Sacrament*, *a ſigne, type, figure, or ſymbol.*

Anſw. True, ſo do we, but they in no place call it a *ſigne, type, figure, or ſimbol only*, ſo as to deny or exclude the verity and ſubſtance of his *body* and *blood*, from being contained under them.

Ob: The *Fathers* ſay ſometimes, *that Chriſt call'd and confeſs'd the bread and wine to be his body and blood.*

Anſw. They ſpeak of his *practick call*, or confeſſion, (viz. the words of conſecration) by which he made the bread and wine to be his *body* and *blood.*

Ob. By the councel at *Conſtantinople* celebrated *in Trullo* it was decreed, *that in the holy miſteries nothing ſhould be offered, but the body of Chriſt as our Lord himſelfe delivered, bread and wine mingled with water.*

Anſw. This *Canon* is expreſly againſt you, for it defines, 1. That the *oblation* in the *ſacred miſteries*

misteries, is and ought to be nothing else, but the body of Christ, as our Lord himselfe hath delivered, this is evident in the words by you objected. *Secondly that the necessary and essential matter of which the Sacrament or offering is made, is bread and wine mingled with water, which we acknowledg, not wine* only without *water*, as the *Armenian Haretiques*, (and you Protestants) *hold*, nor *water* only without *wine*, as the *Aquarii* taught, who were both condemned in that *Canon*, (and you with them) *but wine mingled with water*, as the Catholique Church hath ever taught, and practised; if any other matter should be used, *but only bread and wine mingled with water*, that could not be consecrated, and so *somthing more would be offered then the body of Christ*, contrary to our Saviours *institution*, and this *Canon*. If you dream that it is *bread* and *wine* still after the *consecration*, the report of the *Canon* is sufficient to awake you, *it is then nothing else but the body of Christ*; *Can.* 32. I blush to see, you urge this *Canon* against us; which hath defined it also, to be an *unbloody sacrifice*.

Objections from pretended reason solved.

Ob. IT is impossible for the same *body* to be in many places at once, *ergo*.

Answ. Naturally, and in a corporeal and quantitative manner, I grant; By the omnipe-

tency

tency of God, and in a ſpiritual or ſacramental manner, I deny it, for this is not to be in place properly or by it ſelfe, but improperly and by reaſon of another thing, *viz.* the quantity and accidents of bread under which it is: a proper answer!

Ob. If *Chriſts body* could be in many places at once, it would be divided from it ſelfe, which implies a contradiction, *ergo*.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh your antecedent, by an intrinſecal diviſion of its own entity, from its own entity, I deny it; that is ſtill one and undivided, in how many places ſoever it be put, by the extrinſecal and accidental diviſion of the places, in which it is from one another, I grant it; nor is this any contradiction, more then for one place not to be another.

Ob. If *Chriſts body* were really in many places at once, it would follow that it might at one and the ſame time be moved, and not be moved, be moved upward and downward, above and below, and round about it ſelf, which are groſs contradictions.

Anſw. It would follow, it might be moved with all thoſe contrary motions at the ſame time, by it ſelf, properly, and according to the ſame thing, I deny your antecedent. By accident, improperly, and according to divers quantities or outward formes of bread in which it is, I grant it; nor is this any contradiction

diction. A *contradiction* is defined to be *an affirmation, and negation of the same thing, concerning the same thing, according to the same thing, and at the same time*, which happens not in our case. So your Soul, though one and indivisible in it self, may in your two hands at one and the same time, be moved, and not moved, be moved upward and downward, above and below, and round about it self, without any danger of a contradiction, viz. by accident and by reason of the divers hands, in which it is so moved, improperly speaking.

Do you chafe now not at the bit, and tell me *that the Soul is not in two divers places in the two hands*; for the whole soul is both in the right hand, and left hand, nay it is whole in every finger of each hand, (it hath no parts) unless perhaps you be wiser, and more an oracle in this point, then the generality of the whole worlds Philosophers, as wel Heathen as Christian) neither is the place of the right hand, the place of the left, no more then the motion of the right, is the motion of the left hand; they may be moved at one and the same time, with the contrary motions of upward and downward, which is not possible in one and the same place, without either penetrating or stopping one another; the example, I believe, is homer then you would have it, or will be able easily to solve.

Ob. The

Ob. The Body of Chriſt was made many hundred years ago by the Holy Ghoſt: therfore it cannot now be made by the Prieſt.

Anſw. It was made a natural Body, and preſent in the B. Virgins womb many hundred years ſince I grant: this hinders not but that it may be made a Sacrament, and preſent under the outward forms of bread and wine, by every lawful Prieſt, as often as he conſecrates and ſays Maſſe. Therefore in this ſenſe I denie your conſequence.

Ob. God cannot make a finite Body remaining finite to be in infinite places at once. *Ergo.*

Anſw. I grant all you ſay, ſpeaking of infinite places in Act: for there is no ſuch thing in nature; nothing can be infinite in Bodies, that implies a contradiction indeed: All that we affirm of Chriſts Body in the Sacrament is, that it may be in many places at once, by accident and improperly ſpeaking, by reaſon of the many conſecrated Hoſts in which it is: and that it never is actually in ſo many, but that it may be in more; not that this Potentiality can ever be reduced to an infinite Act. So natural Philoſophie teaches, *that every leaſt continued quantity is diviſible into infinite parts*, but withal it demonſtrates, *that this Potentiality can never wholly be reduced into Act*: for then that which is only infinite in Potentiality, would be infinite in Act, which is a contradiction.

Ob.

Ob. Christs Body in the Sacrament may be every where, according to you, which is one of Gods properties: Therfore it may be God.

Answ. Your antecedent is false; it can be no where, but only in the place of consecrated Bread: And there will alwayes be somthing else in the world besides that, I warrant you. But to favour your argument all that may be, let us press on the supposition grosly as you do, and I suppose for once, that God will annihilate all other things, and fil the whole corporeal space of the Universe with nothing else but consecrated Hosts, were this enough to make it have Gods property, and to be every where as He is every where? No, nothing less: For it would stil be limited and finite, and shut up under the accidents of bread; whereas it is Gods property to be every where, not as contained, but containing all things, after an infinite, and unlimited manner. Nor is your consequence less absurd, seeing nothing may, or can be God, but what is God in Act from all eternity. He is an infinite, uncreated, eternal, and most pure Act, compatible with no Potentiality.

Ob. If the same body at the same time, and according to the same thing, could be *here* (at *London*) and *there* (at *York*) properly speaking; It would be *here* and not *here*, *there* and not *there*, &c.

But

But the *body* of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament* (according to you) at the ſame time, and according to the ſame thing, is *here* (at *London*) and *there* (at *York*) properly ſpeaking.

Therefore the *body* of *Chriſt*, in the Sacrament, at the ſame time, and according to the ſame thing, is *here* and not *here*, *there* and not *there*, &c.

Anſw. I deny firſt your *major*, for though to be at *London*, and not at *London*, is a cleer contradiction, yet to be at *London* and *York* at the ſame time, is as cleerly none at all. And ſecondly I deny both your *minor* and conſequence, for they both proceed on this falſe ſuppoſition, viz. *That the body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is in place properly and by it ſelf, that is, by the intrinſecall determination of its own ſitual or local extenſion*; which we deny. It is in the Sacrament after a ſpiritual and ſacramental manner of being; and is in place only by accident, or improperly, that is, by the extrinſecal determination of the divers quantities or outward forms of bread, under which it is, and this implies no contratiction, becauſe the affirmation and negation are not verified according to the ſame thing, but according to thoſe divers quantities or outward forms of bread.

You reply, It is determined to be *here* and not to be *here*, by its own intrinſecal entity or

or nature. Therefore according to the ſame thing.

Anſw. I deny your whoſe argument, ſubſtance or a ſpirit is not determined to place, of it ſelf, or by its own entity, but by reaſon of ſome accident. *It is the common opinion amongſt Wiſe men* (ſayes Boetius) *that incorporeal things be not in place.* l. an. omne quod eſt bonum ſit? *The ſoul is only in place by accident* (ſayes Ariſtotle) 4. *Phyſ. tex.* 45. And again, *Neither are thoſe things that are there* (viz. above the convex *ſuperficies* of the higheſt Heaven) *apt to to be in place.* *l.* 1. *de cœlo tex.* 99. & 100. Chriſts Body hath a ſubſtantial and ſpiritual manner of being in the Sacraments. You fret again at this, but who can help it? *'Tis the received Philoſophy of the World, and all Wiſe men,* and therfore will not be altered or diſcredited upon your whimſical & heretical fancie. When *Ariſtotles Philoſophie* will ſerve your turn, you triumph in it, but when it contradicts you, then you ſleight it, and ſet your ſelf up in the chair, both againſt Him, and all wiſe men.

This ſolution rightly underſtood with that of the argument concerning *contrary motions*, will ſerve to uncouple the whole pack of ſeeming contradictions, which bark ſo lowd, and furiouſly, againſt the *real preſence*, and *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Ob. Your *real preſence* is a very *idol*, for it makes

makes *Chriſt have eyes and not ſee, ears and not hear, &c.* ergo.

Anſw. I told you, you were angry, your antecedent is a very blaſphemy, for though the actual exerciſe of theſe corporal faculties be ſuſpended in the Sacrament for a greater good, by reaſon of its ſpiritual manner of being there; yet the powers are not taken away (but ſtill the ſame, and ſubjected in the ſoul,) no more then they were taken away by his ſleeping in this life, or being in his mothers wombe. And this kind of explication you muſt know is but an opinion among ſome Divines; others, in my judgment, upon better grounds, affirm Chriſts *hearing* and *ſeeing* to bee in the Sacrament as truly as his body, though both alike imperceptible to our ſenſes; nor does this hinder, but that he alwaies is a ſeeing, hearing, knowing, and living God, he hears your blaſphemy, and will puniſh it if you retract it not by timely penance.

Ob. If the *body* of *Chriſt* have a ſpiritual manner of being in the Sacrament, it cannot nouriſh our bodies. Therefore the oral receiving of it is to no purpoſe.

Anſw. It cannot nouriſh our bodies, by being changed into our bodies, as other common meats are, I grant; it cannot nouriſh them by a vertual contact, I deny both your antecedent, and conſ quence, for as *to the un-*

worthy eater, it cauſeth ſickneſs and death, 1. *Cor.* 11. So to the worthy eater it brings health and life. Nor could the wiſdom of God ever have invented a more forcible motive of devotion, or more effectual means of comfort to his Church, then this of his *real and ſubſtantial preſence* alwaies with her.

Ob. All the benefit accrues to us by the action of the ſoul, not of the body. Therefore it is only received by the ſoul and by faith, not by the mouth.

Anſw. It accrues to us indeed more principally by the action of the ſoul, but not wholly, the body alſo hath an inſtrumental ſhare in it, by making *Chriſts body really and ſubſtantially preſent* in our bodies, which could not be effected by the ſoul or by faith only without oral receiving it, which very oral receiving it encreaſes charity by the help of our ſenſes.

Ob. You pray in the *Maſs that giving thanks for the Sacrament receiv'd, you may receive greater benifits, and tend to the fullneſs of the heavenly Sacrament.* Therefore *Chriſt* is not *really* and *ſubſtantially* in the Sacrament, for nothing is greater then he.

Anſw. I grant your antecedent, but deny your conſequence, becauſe though nothing can be greater then he, and the ſame *Chriſt* be received both in heaven and in the Sacrament, the manner of receiving him ſhall be fuller

and

and more perfect there, then here; here we receive him veil'd or clouded under the accidents of bread and wine; There in the clear and beatifique vision of his divine and humane nature, which is the *fulness of the heavenly Sacrament.*

Ob. Christ hath no where commanded the Sacrament to be adored, therefore if his body were really there, yet ought it not to be adored.

Answ. I grant your antecedent, but deny your consequence. So *Christ* hath no where commanded his natural body to be adored, yet he that should deny it adoration, were an *Arian.* The reason of this is, because both had been sufficiently commanded before in those words, *The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, Deut.* 6.13. *and* 10.20. Which command is unlimited and reacheth to all times and places where he is really, and truly *present.* And therefore it was enough for him to declare himself to be God and *really present* in the Sacrament, to infer a necessity of our adoring him in it. *If at the name of Jesus every knee bow,* Phil. 2. 10. much more at the *real,* and *substantial presence of his divine and humane nature.*

Ob. By adoring the Sacrament with divine adoration, you adore a creature (*viz.* the outward forms of bread and wine) with divine adoration, which is idolatry.

Answ. We adore not the outward formes of bread and wine for themselves, or properly, but by accident only and improperly, inasmuch as they contain *Christ God and Man*, in whom our adoration is properly and essentially terminated. Nor is this any more idolatry, then it was in the holy Saints, when they adored Christ on earth, to adore also his garments by accident, as they contained his Person; with whom he was so pleased, that he wrought special miracles for many of them; witnesse the *Woman whom he cured of the bloudy flux, for only touching his garments hem.*

Ob. You are not certain that Christ is really there, because if the Priest have not a right intention, the consecration is not valid: Therefore you expose your selves to great danger of idolatry by adoring it.

Answ. I deny your antecedent, we have a morall certainty of it by the outward action of the Priest applying the true matter to the true form, and then elevating, and adoring the Host himself, to signifie to us that it is consecrated; which is enough to warrant the lawfulness of our act, and all that God requireth of us. To your probation, I answer, that great Doctors, and those as yet uncensured by the Church, tell us, that the practical intention, which consists only in the performance of the

the foresaid outward actions, sufficeth to the validity of the consecration, whatever the speculative or inward intention of the Priest may be: therfore your consequence is not valid. And if in any possible supposition, the Priest should not consecrate, yet could not our adoration of it be formal idolatry; because that is still terminated properly, and essentially in Christ, where ever he be.

Ob. The Apostles sate when they communicated, therfore they did not adore the Sacrament.

An. I grant your antecedent, but deny your consequence: they adored in spirit, by acts of faith and charity, (which is the best & chiefest adoration) though not with outward genuflection, which is not always necessary, though very requisite in fit time, and now generally commanded by the Church. Let S. *Augustine* speak the mind of Antiquity: *Of earth* (saith he) *Christ took earth, inasmuch as flesh is earth, and of the flesh of* Mary *he took flesh, and walk'd here in that flesh, and hath given us the same to be eaten to salvation; and no man eateth that flesh* (*viz:* worthily)) *unlesse he first adore it*, in Psal. 98. in illum versic. *Adore ye the footstool of his feet.*

Ob. You have no warrant for keeping or reserving the Sacrament.

Answ. Yes; we have both in the firſt Nicene Council. *Can.* 12 14, and infinite examples of Antiquity. See *S. Greg. Nazianz. in Gorgon. S. Ambroſe oratione obitu fratris Satiri*, &c: Add to this the authority and practice of the whole Church.

ARTICLE XI.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

OUr Tenet is, *That though the accidents or outward forms of bread and wine remain the ſame after conſecration, yet the whole ſubſtance of the bread and wine is changed by the words of conſecration, into the whole ſubſtance of the body and bloud of Chriſt*; which we prove thus.

The firſt Argument.

Ma. Tranſubſtantiation is nothing elſe but a change of one whole ſubſtance into another.

Mi. But by the words of conſecration the whole ſubſtance of the bread and wine is changed

changed into the whole ſubſtance of the body and bloud of Chriſt.

Conſ. Therfore by the words of conſecration is made a Tranſubſtantiation.

The *major* is proved by the Churches declaration, both in the Councils of Florence, Lateran, and Trent, that ſhe intends nothing elſe by it.

The *minor* is proved by all the texts of Scripture above cited, which ſignifie a reall change of the ſubſtance of the bread and wine into the body &bloud of Chriſt, but not of the accidents; for they remain the ſame, as is evident to ſenſe, and granted by our Adverſaries; nor is there any mention of them at all in the words of conſecration.

A ſecond Argument.

Ma. If the ſubſtance of the bread and wine remained the ſame after conſecration, the pronoune *this* (in thoſe words *This is my body*) muſt of neceſſity demonſtrate the ſubſtance of the bread and wine, after conſecration.

Mi. But the pronoune *this*, in thoſe words, does not demonſtrate the ſubſtance of the bread and wine after conſecration, but the ſubſtance of the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*.

Conſ. Therefore the ſubſtance of the bread

and wine does not remain after conſecration.

The *major* is proved, becauſe the pronoune demonſtrative *this*, after the words of conſecration are ſpoken, ſignifies of neceſſity the ſubſtance then preſent, as all, grant.

The *minor* is proved, becauſe if it ſhould then demonſtrate the ſubſtance of bread and wine, the propoſition would be evidently falſe, and ſignifie bread and wine to be the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, which is impoſſible.

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond age *S. Cyprian*, *the bread which our Lord gave to his diſciples being changed, not in ſhape* (outward forme) *but in nature* (ſubſtance) *by the omnipotency of the word is made fleſh*, Sermon. de cœna Dom.

In the third age *Origen*, *We eat the bread offered by prayer made a certaine holy body* (the body of Chriſt) *l.* 8. *cont. Celſum.*

In the ſame age *Tertullian*, *The bread taken and diſtributed to his diſciples, he made his body*, l. 4. cont. Marcion. c. 40.

In the fourth age *S. Ambroſe*, *If humane benediction could change & convert nature* (he had exemplified in *Moſes* converting a rod into a Serpent) *what ſay we by the divine conſecration where the very words of our Saviour do work*, &c.

ſhall

ſhall not the word of Chriſt prevaile ſo far as to change the ſpecies or nature of the Elements, l. 4. de Sacram. c. 4. De iis qui myſter. c. 9.

In the ſame age *S. Cyril*; *Once in Cana of Galilee he changed water into wine, &c. and ſhall he not be worthy to be beleived of us, that he has changed wine into his blood*, Catecheſ. Myſtagog. 1. c. 4.

In the ſame age *S. Gregory Niſſen*; *Chriſt through the diſpenſation of his grace, enters by his fleſh into all the faithfull*, &c. *and theſe things he beſtows, tranſelementing* (tranſubſtantiating) *by vertue of his bleſſing the things that are ſeen, into it*, Orat. Catechiſt. c. 37.

In the fifth age *S. Auguſtine*; *they* (the reſt of the diſciples) *did eat the bread which was our Lord himſelfe, he* (Judas) *did eat the bread of our Lord againſt our Lord.* Tract. 59. in Joan.

If you infer out of this text, that *Judas* did not at all eat the *Bread which was our Lord*, becauſe he wanted true faith; Therefore no man receives the *Body* of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament by the mouth, but by faith only. I Anſwer; *Judas* had before at leaſt, if not in this place, received the *Bread which was our Lord himſelf*, according to *S. Auguſtine*, *Our Lord* (ſaith he) *ſuffers Judas, a divel, a theif, he that ſold him, he lets him receive among the innocent diſciples, that which the faithfull know to be our price*, l. 5. *De Baptiſm. c. 8.* when he ſaies *Judas eat the bread of our Lord, a-*

gainſt

gainſt our Lord. 'tis probable he ſpeaks not of the *Sacrament* (though *Judas* eat that alſo *againſt our Lord*, becauſe unworthily to his own damnation) but rather of the *dipped ſop* which *Judas* is ſaid to *eat againſt our Lord*, becauſe he then renewed his purpoſe of betraying him, ſo that *the Divil entred him, and he went forth immediately to act his treaſon, Judas did not then* (ſaith S. Auguſtine) *receive the body of our Lord, as ſome, who read negligently, think; for we muſt underſtand that our Lord had already given the Sacrament of his body to them, where Judas alſo was*, (*tract. 62. in Joan.*) So that your conſequence is null.

The Council of *Florence* defined, *that by vertue of the words of conſecration, the ſubſtance of the bread is converted into the body of Chriſt, and the ſubſtance of the wine into his blood*, decret ſup. union. Jacobinorum, & Armenorum. Anno 1439.

The *Lateran* councel under *Innocent* the third defined, *that bread is by divine power tranſubſtantiated into the body, and wine into the blood of Chriſt, ca. 1. an. Dom.* 1215.

Objections out of Scripture ſolved.

Ob. WHat Chriſt promiſed in the ſixt of *S. John*, is bread and fleſh too. *The bread which I will give is my fleſh.* Therefore

fore the Sacrament is bread and fleſh too; therfore *tranſubſtantiation.*

Anſw. *'Tis bread* (in the outward likeneſs) and *fleſh too* (in the inward ſubſtance) thus I grant your antecedent. *'Tis* bread in the inward ſubſtance, ſo I deny it, or *'Tis heavenly bread and fleſh too, I grant it, earthly or common bread, I deny it*: and ſo granting alſo your firſt conſequence, I deny your ſecond.

Ob. If by thoſe words *this is my body*, the whole ſubſtance of the bread be chang'd into the ſubſtance of *Chriſts Body*, you cannot prove by any good reaſon, that the accidents of the bread are not changed by the ſame, into the accidents of his *body*. Therefore ſince the accidents are not changed, neither is the ſubſtance.

Anſw. Nor need I take much pains to prove by reaſon that the accidents remain, ſince they are evident to ſenſe, however I deny your antecedent; one reaſon is, becauſe the word *hoc* or *this* ſignifies only ſubſtance indeterminatly and as abſtracting from all time or accidents, ſo that when the *Predicate my body* is added, the whole propoſition is ſufficiently verified, by the only change of the ſubſtance into his *body*, without any change of the accidents.

A ſecond reaſon is, becauſe, if the accidents were alſo changed into the accidents of his

body,

body, it were an identical and not a formal predication, and would signifie only *my body is my body*, there being no difference at all betwixt the *subject* and the *predicate*, whereas the accidents remaining the same, and the substance only being changed, it makes this sense, the substance contain'd under these accidents is my *body*, which imports an accidental difference betwixt them, and sufficeth to a formal predication, these reasons we have from the very words of the *institution*. And for reasons of convenience, one is, because we should have a horror to eat *Christs flesh* in its own proper shape, nor could we do it without mangling it, and therefore he hath given it us in the outward shape of bread, in which we may eat it without any such inconvenience. A second reason is, that so there might be somthing frangible in the Sacrament, to signifie and represent the real breaking of his *body* on the *Cross*. These and many other reasons may be given, without much rubbing our foreheads, wherefore I deny your consequence.

Objections out of Fathers solved.

Ob. SOme primitive Fathers say, *We must undoubtedly believe the real presence*, but *ought not to inquire how, or search into the manner of it*; therefore the Church did ill in defineing *Transubstantiation*. *Answ.*

Answ. They say well, but you infer ill. So we must humbly believe the mystery of the *B. Trinity*, without curiously enquiring how three distinct persons can be in one indivisible nature, and yet the Church did well both in defining that there are three, and how there are three, against the *Arians*, and *Antitrinitarians*, and therefore I deny your consequence. *A general Council*, assisted by the *Holy Ghost*, may safely enquire into and define those things, which private men and Doctors ought rather to believe, without enquiring. Had not the inquisitive and overcurious *why's* and *how's* of Sectaries inforc'd her to it, by obtruding their false glosses on the words of consecration, 'tis more then probable to me, the Church had never defined so far in it as now she hath.

Ob. Tertullian sayes, *God in the Gospel called bread his body, that hence we might understand, he gave to bread the figure of his body, whose body anciently the Prophet figured by bread.* Lib. 3. cont. Marcion.

Answ. The sense of *Tertullian* is plain: His question against *Marcion* was, whether Christs body were true and real, which he proves by this argument; That which is not true cannot have a figure, but bread is the figure of Christs body, therefore Christs body is true. Now this Father (as it is confessed by all) having a

cros

croſs manner of expreſſion, delivers himſelf in the words alledg'd, whoſe ſenſe is, that Chriſt, by ſaying, *This is my Body*, verified the ſaying of the Prophet, who had figuratively called his body bread; for bread could not be truly a figure, till there was made a body, whoſe figure it might be, which was then done. This he calls, *that he gave bread the figure of his body*, not meaning to that particular bread which he had taken in his hand, but the nature of bread, of which the Prophet ſpake, and by which he figur'd the body of our Saviour; So that if our Saviour had done nothing but called the body his bread in words, he had done no more then the Prophet, and not fulfilled the figure of the Propheſie, but repeated it. But *Tertullian* will have us underſtand, that by theſe words of our Saviour, the nature of bread, which the Prophet ſpake of, got truly to be the figure of Chriſts body, to wit, becauſe Chriſts body by theſe words became truly alimental to us, and therfore with great propriety to be figur'd by bread, as the Prophet had done. *Tertullians* argument therefore ſpeaks of the figure which the Prophet made (which now began truly to be a figure) not of a new figure which our Saviour made. And by this you may underſtand that other place objected out of him, *viz. The bread taken and diſtributed to his Diſciples he made his body*

dy, by saying, This is my body; *that is, a figure of my body*, l.4.cont. Marcion.c.40. *That Christ made bread his body*, he plainly and positively affirms; how he made it his body, is no less plain, *viz.* by saying, *this is my body*; and that he made it likewise a figure, signe, or Sacrament of his body, is agreed upon by all: The difference is, that you would have these words, *that is a figure of my body*, relate to the predicate, *my body*, whereas indeed they relate to the subject, *hoc*, or *this*, and make this construction. *This, that is, a figure of my body, is my body.* Bread was a figure of his body in the old Law, and he made the outward form or accidents of bread, to be a figure, or Sacrament of his body in the new, at his last Supper: Nor is this form of speech unusuall in him. He sayes in another place, *Christ is dead, that is, the Annointed*, for, *Christ, that is, the Annointed, is dead*, l. cont. Prax. c. 19. Or if nothing will serve you, but your own way, know that we allow his very body, as unbloudily offered in the Sacrament, to be a figure of his body as bloudily offered on the cross; what does this place advantage you, or prejudice us?

Ob. *Clemens Alexandrinus* sayes, *The bloud of Christ is twofold, the one is carnall, by which we are redeemed from death, the other spirituall, by which we are annointed.* Pæd. l.2.c.2.

Answ. He calls the *Bloud of Christ carnall*, as

as it was shed on the cross, because it was there shed in a carnal manner; He calls it *spiritual, as it annoints us in the Sacrament*, because it is there after a spiritual manner, all this we hold. Neither doth he deny it to be the same blood in substance in both places; the diversity is only in the manner of being.

You reply, That in the same chapter he brings in Christ saying, *Take, drink, this is my blood, the blood of the vine.*

Answ. He means of a heavenly, not of an earthly vine.

You urge, it follows, *But that the thing which had been blessed was wine, he shewed again, saying to his Disciples, I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, untill I drink it new in my Fathers Kingdome.*

Answ. It was heavenly wine, proportionable to the Vine it came from, as appears by those words, *Untill I drink it new in my Fathers kingdom:* the fruit of no earthly vine is drunk there.

Ob. S. *Cyprian* sayes, *Christ, at his last Supper with his Disciples, gave bread and wine with his own hands, but on the cross he gave the souldiers his body to be wounded.* Tract. de Unct.

Answ. He calls the *things signified* (*viz.* his body and blood) by the names of the *signes:* He expounds himself, saying, *Christ did this, that in the Apostles the sincere truth, and true*

sincerity

ſincerity being more ſecretly imprinted, he might explain to the Gentiles how bread and Wine ſhould be his fleſh and blood (mark what it was that he called bread and wine) *and by what reaſons divers names and kinds* (bread and wine, fleſh and blood) *might be reduced into one eſſence* (one Sacrament) *and the ſignifying and the ſignified be reckoned by the ſame words,* (*viz.* bread and wine.) Thus his own expoſition, which to my beſt underſtanding is rather for, then againſt us. We know the Fathers ſomtimes call the conſecrated Hoſts ſymbols, types, figures, but never ſo as to exclude the verity of the thing typified and figured, as Sectaries do. So that Objections of this nature are meer trifling and of no ſtrength againſt us.

Ob. S. *Chryſoſtome* ſayes, *For as before the bread is ſanctified we name it bread, but the divine grace ſanctifying it by means of the Prieſt, it is freed from the name of bread, and deemed worthy to be called the Lords Body, although the nature of the bread remain in it.* Epiſt. ad Cæſ. cont. hæreſ. Apolin. citat. per Damaſcen.

Anſw. This Objection is clearly againſt you, excepting only thoſe words, *Although the nature of the bread remains in it,* by which he only means the Qualities or Accidents of the Bread, not the Subſtance of it, as appears by thoſe precedent words, *The bread is ſanctified by the divine grace, by means of the Prieſt, it is*

freed from the name of bread, and deemed worthy to be called our Lords Body, (which could not be, if the ſubſtance of bread remained.) The word *Nature* is often taken for the qualities and properties of a thing. So we ſay in common ſpeech, he's of a *good nature*, he's of an *ill nature*, I love his *nature*, I hate his *nature*, meaning his good and evil qualities, or properties, not his ſubſtance.

Ob. S. *Ambroſe* ſayes, *It is a Wonderfull power of God that makes the bread remain what it is, and yet be changed into another thing.* L. 4. de Sacrament. c. 4.

Anſw. The ſenſe of S. *Ambroſe* is, that the bread periſhes not, but remains virtually in that into which it is changed; an effect that certainly requires no leſs then a wonderfull power. But it were no wonderful power if it ſhould make the bread no other thing, then what nature and the Baker made it, but onely change it into a ſigne or figure of his Body: This requires no omnipotence for doing it. You might in much modeſty have ſpared this Objection, as alſo that of the ſame Father: *How much more operative is the word of Chriſt, that the things be What they were* (*viz.* in the outward ſhape) *and yet be changed* (*viz.* in the ſubſtance) *into another thing* (the body of Chriſt) *and ſo that which was bread before conſecration is now the Body of Chriſt*, (he tells you plainly what

what it is changed into.) *L.* 4. *de Sacrament. c.* 4. What frontleſs confidence is it in you to triumph in theſe texts?

Ob. Some of your Schoolmen, as *Durand, Scotus, Peter Lombard &c.* ſay, Tranſubſtantiation was not heard of till of later times.

Anſw. They quarrel at the newneſs of the word, not at the meaning of it; but tell not us in controverſies of Faith of the *placita* of Schools, or what this or that particular Schoolman ſayes, who deliver but their own private opinions, and thoſe alſo with ſubmiſſion to the Churches judgment. Tell us what is plainly ſaid in *Scripture*, and ſo expounded by the *Church*, or what hath been delivered by *Apoſtolicall tradition* from age to age, or what the *Fathers* have plainly and unanimouſly taught, or what hath been defined in *Councils perfectly œcumenicall:* Theſe, and nothing leſs are teſtimonies ſufficient, to prove a controverted point to be of faith, or not.

Ob. Tranſubſtantiation was not heard of til the *Council* of *Lateran.*

Anſw. The word was not agreed upon in any *general Council* before that, I grant; the meaning or thing ſignified by the word, I deny it: that was believed and taught from the firſt *inſtitution* of the *Sacrament*, as hath been proved; ſee the *Councils* above.

Objections from reason, and sense, answered.

Ob. TRansubstantiation is not expresly in the *Scripture*. Therefore we have no reason to believe it with divine faith.

Answ. The meaning of the word is, though the word be not, and it sufficeth to a point of faith, that it be any way in the Scripture, either plainly or obscurely, expresly or implicitly, the Churches authority and exposition, or definition being added. Otherwise the *mistery* of the *Trinity*, *the necessity of infants Baptisme*, &c. would not be points of faith, they be not expresly and plainly in the Scripture; nor be the words there at all, no more then *transubstantiation*, therefore your consequence is false.

Ob. It is impossible for one whole substance to be chang'd into another, *ergo*.

Answ. Naturally, or by a mere natural agent, whose activity is limited and alwaies presupposeth a subject to work upon, I grant it; By a supernatural agent, whose power is infinite, and unlimited, I deny it; Christ is alwaies the principal agent in this work, the *Priest* is but his instrument only.

Ob. If the whole substance of the bread were changed into the *Body* of *Christ*, the accidents of bread could not remaine as they do,

they

they cannot be without a ſubject.

Anſw. Naturally or by the force of nature, I grant it, by miracle and the omnipotency of God, I deny it. Actual inherence in a ſubject is not of eſſence, of quantity, or any other accident, but only to be apt to be in a ſubject; to be in, in all abſolute entities (ſuch as quantity is) muſt of neceſſity preſuppoſe to be; at leaſt, in the eſſential notion of it.

Ob. The ſame *body* cannot be in many places at once.

Anſw. Circumſcribed, or locally extended, I grant; In a ſpiritual and Sacramental manner, I deny it.

Ob. Quantity is eſſential to a body. Therefore if his body be in the Sacrament, his quantity muſt needs be there.

Anſw. I diſtinguiſh your antecedent, quantity extended metaphiſically, inwardly or in order to it ſelfe, is eſſentiall to a body I grant; Quantity extended phiſically, or in order to place, I deny it, that is only a property of Quantity, and therefore ſeparable from it by Gods omnipotence. *It is moſt proper to quantity* (ſaith *Ariſtotle*) *to be equall*, 5. *Metaphiſ.* that is to be locally extended with ſome determinate figure. Quantity is an abſolute entity, and therefore cannot eſſentially conſiſt of order to place, which is a mere relation, I give the ſame diſtinction to your conſequence.

Ob. For the same *body* to be *here* and *there* at the same time implies a contradiction.

Answ. You mistake; for the same body to be *here* & not to be *here*, implies a contradiction, or for the same body to be *here*, and to be *there* properly (that is locally extended) at the same time & according to the same thing, implies a contradiction true, but not to be *here* and to be *there*, improperly (that is sacramentally) and according to divers things (to wit divers quantities) as Christs body is in the Sacrament. The soul is *here* (in the head) and *there* (in the foot) at the same time, improperly and spiritually, by reason of the divers parts of the body, without any contradiction.

Ob. A body is destroid, if it be not in some determinate place.

Answ. That Proposition is not universally true. *Aristotle* saies and proves, *that the universe, or highest heaven is in no place, because nothing is without, or above it, to contain it*, 4. *Phis. text.* 45. Yet we grant that Christs *body* in the *Sacrament* is alwaies in some determinate place improperly and by accident, viz. in the place of the quantity, under which it is, it is so determinated to place by the dimensions or outward formes of bread and wine as never to be out of the place of the said dimensions or outward formes.

Ob. nothing can be in two divers times at once.

once. Therefore nothing can be in two divers places at once.

Answ. I deny your consequence; the disparity is because divers times cannot be together or at once (by me being essentially successive) but divers places may, and are.

Ob. A spirit which is naturally indivisible, cannot be made divisible even by Gods omnipotence. Therefore quantity which is naturally divisible in order to place, cannot be made indivisible in order to place even by Gods omnipotence.

Answ. I grant your antecedent but deny your consequence, the disparity is, that it is not only natural, but essential to a spirit, to be indivisible, and have no parts, but it is not essential, though it be natural to quantity to be divisible, or have parts extended in order to place, but only in order to it selfe. *And he that could make the Sea a solid path to his own feet, S. Math.* 14. *enter to his disciples the doores being shut, S Jo.* 20. *make a bush burne and not consume, Exod* 3. *make Iron swim on the water,* 4. *Kings.* 6. *make the Sea stand like a wall about his people Exod.* 14. can doubtless change the natural, and common manner of being which things have, and yet be able to conserve their essences, your Scholars know this to be possible and confess it, and so do you when you forget your selfe, as I have shewed above;

your ſhifts in eluding theſe places are too poor to merit an anſwer:

He that can make material ſubſtances, which of their own nature are indiviſible in order to place, diviſible by means of quantity, even by his ordinary power, and way of working, can doubtleſs by his extraordinary, make quantity, which naturally is diviſible in order to place, become indiviſible, by giving it a ſupernatural, and ſacramental manner of being.

Ob. Bread might be called the *body* of *Chriſt* by only being made one thing with his body, although it were not *tranſubſtantiated* into his body.

Anſw. No it could not. The ſoule of man is made one thing with his body, and yet the body cannot be call'd the ſoule, nor the ſoule the body.

Ob. Man in Chriſt is called God, and God man. Therefore bread in the Sacrament may be call'd the *body* of *Chriſt*.

Anſw. I grant your antecedent, but deny your conſequence, the diſparity is, becauſe *God and man in Chriſt are united in one perſon.* Bread is not ſo united to the *body* of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament.

Ob. The thing containing may be call'd the thing contained; ſo we call a *barrel, ſack, a purſe, Gold &c.* Therefore *bread* containing only

only the *body of Christ*, may be call'd the *body of Christ*, though it remaine unchanged.

Answ. Your antecedent is true in a figurative sense, because a barrel, and a purse are of their own nature made to containe, and suppose for *sack* and *gold*, but *bread* was not of its own nature and primary *institution*, made to contain and suppose for the *body* of *Christ*, (this was superadded to the accidents or outward formes of bread only by *Christ at his last Supper*) but to contain and be the nourishment of mans body.

Ob. S. Austine saies, *it is impossible for Christ to be at once according to his corporal presence, in the Sun, and in the Moon, and on the Cross.*

Answ. We maintaine not his corporal, but real and spiritual presence in the Sacrament, the manner of being is spiritual, and sacramental, you have been often told it. He speaks there against the *Manichees*, who held the *body that was crucified to be a fantastical body, and that the corporal light of the Sun and Moon were the true body of Christ*, which *S. Augustine* proves to be false, because a body cannot be in many places at once, after a bodily manner; this is not against us,

Ob. Sense cannot be deceiv'd in its proper object, and sense tels us 'tis bread after consecration, *ergo.*

Answ. Substance is not the proper and immediate

immediate object of ſenſe, but colour, quantity &c. nor can ſenſe judge at all of ſubſtance, though it be under ſenſible accidents, unleſs it be the ſubject of thoſe accidents, and have a ſenſible and corporal manner of being; which the *body* of *Chriſt* neither is, nor hath in the *Sacrament*. It hath a ſpiritual manner of being, and is not the ſubject of the accidents of bread, they are without a ſubject by miracle, therefore no wonder if ſenſe be deceived in this matter. Here ſenſe and reaſon muſt vaile bonnet to faith, and ſubmit to the authority of God revealing and the Church propounding; they are no competent Judges, what God can do by his omnipotence.

Ob. S. John proved the verity of the *incarnation*, and God made man, againſt *Cerinthus* and his complices, by the evidence of ſenſe. *That which we have ſeen with our eyes, and our hands have handled, we declare unto you*, &c. 1. Jo. 1.

Anſw. You deceiptfully leave out the firſt, and principal part of his proofe, viz. *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard*, &c. v. 1. his chiefe probation of that miſtery was not grounded on ſeeing and feeling only, as you pretend, but on *hearing, faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God revealing*. He had heard *that which was from the beginning, viz. Chriſt* revealing thoſe things, and therefore

therefore believed them, and declared them to us to be beleived. The other part of his proofe from seeing and feeling, was only *ad Hominem*, against *Cerinthus*, and such as you are, who will believe nothing, without a sensible experiment of it; whereas true *faith is an argument of things not appearing*.

Ob. If the notions and evidence of sense be not infallible about its own proper object, there can be no certainty in the knowledg of bodies, and sense must needs be the perpetual cause of deception in this mistery to all the world, which is absurd, *ergo*.

Answ. They are infallible about the proper objects of sense, if they be duly propos'd, and reason consider rightly of all circumstances, but the *body* of *Christ* in the *Sacrament* is not the proper object of sense, but of faith, it hath a spiritual, and supernatural manner of being, and we have a more infallible assurance then that of sense, to regulate our assent by, in this matter; viz. the divine authority revealing; he that will credit that, & *captivate* the uncertain notions of sense to the *obedience of faith* (as all good Christians ought to do) is not in the least dainger of being deceived by sense in this mistery, but such as will obstinately prefer the seeming evidence of sense, before the certain authority of God revealing, and his Church propounding (as you do) are worthy

to

to be ſlaved for ever to the deception and fallacy of ſenſe, may God deal better with yow, then you deſerve, which is my hearty prayer for you.

Ob. If the doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* were true, and *Chriſts body* were whole in the whole hoſt, and whole in every part of the hoſt, if you divide, or break it, it would follow, your *Laicks* can conſecrate, as well as *Prieſts*, becauſe when they divide the hoſt in their mouthes, they make *Chriſt* (who before was preſent only in one place) to be now preſent in many; riddle mee this riddle.

Anſw. You pleaſe your ſelf with your own miſtakes. I deny the ſequel of your argument, that action of the *Laicks* of it ſelfe and properly ſpeaking reaches only to the diviſion of the ſignes, or accidents, not to the preſence of *Criſts body* to the ſignes, or in many places, the efficient and proper cauſe of that, are the words of *conſecration* ſpoken by the *Prieſts*, by which the whole ſubſtance of his body is made preſent in place of the whole ſubſtance of the bread, and by a neceſſary conſequence, in every part of the ſignes or accidents if you divide: the Laities diviſion of them is only *Conditio ſine qua non*, a condition, without which the effect of his preſence in many places is not put, not the efficient cauſe thereof.

Ob. Chriſt proved the verity of his own *Reſurrection*

ſurrection by the evidence of ſenſe, when he ſaid to his diſciples: *ſee my hands and feet, that it is I my ſelfe, handle and ſee, S. Lu.* 24. 39.

Anſw. The evidence of ſenſe was infallible in that caſe, to prove the *Body* of *Chriſt* to be his true *body*, and not a *phantaſme*, as the miſtaken diſciples thought his *body* had there a ſenſible, corporal, and natural manner of being, not ſo in the *Sacrament*; nevertheleſs the verity of his *reſurrection*, as it is an article of faith, hath a much higher and more infallible proofe then that of ſenſe, *viz.* the authority of the *Prophets* and *Chriſt* himſelfe revealing it. *They will kill him, and on the third day he ſhall riſe againe, S. Lu.* 18. 33.

Ob. In the *profeſſion* of faith preſcrib'd to *Berengarius* by the *Pope*, it is ſaid; *That the Body of Chriſt is ſenſibly touched by the hands and chew'd by the teeth.* Therefore the manner of its being is ſenſible, and not ſpiritual.

Anſw. I deny your conſequence, the words of the *Profeſſion* run thus. *I Berengarius profeſs, &c. The bread and wine which are ſet on the altar after conſecration, to be not only a Sacrament, but alſo the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and I profeſs it* (the conſecrated bread and wine ſaies the relection of that Council) *to be ſenſibly touch'd by the hands of Prieſts, and chew'd by the teeth of the faithful, not only in the Sacrament, but in* verity, &c. all this we grant

in

in a ſound ſenſe. His *body* is ſaid *to be ſenſibly chew'd by the teeth and touch'd by the hands* in this reſpect, that the whole ſubſtance of his body remains and is preſent *in verity* and without fiction under every part of the devided hoſt; that is, his body is ſaid to be *ſenſibly touch'd by the hands, and chew'd by the teeth*, not by it ſelfe or according to its own entity, but by accident and by meanes of the ſignes or accidents of bread under which it truly is; thus the relection of that very Council expounds the Council. *Berengarius* was there condemned *for denying the true and real preſence of Chriſts body in the Sacrament or ſignes*, not for holding it to be there after a ſpiritual manner of being, this was ever moſt true and Catholique doctrine, therefore it cannot without abſurdity be imagined that the meaning of his *profeſſion* ſhould be, that *Chriſts Body* is in the Sacrament after a ſenſible, & corporeal manner.

You reply; *His body is ſenſibly touch'd and chew'd not only in the Sacrament, but in verity.*

Anſw. We grant it; for by the words, *In verity*, is meant no more, then *truly and without fiction.* That which we ſenſibly touch & chew is *not only a Sacrament or ſigne*, but alſo the *body and blood of Chriſt in verity*, that is, *truly and without fiction*, and therefore his *body* may be ſaid *to be ſenſibly touch'd & chew'd in verity*, that is, without fiction, not by it ſelf, or according

to its own entity, but by means of the Sacrament or signes, which are so touch'd and chewd, and under which it is in verity, that is *truly and without fiction*. I declare this by an example: *Jonas* was sensibly swallow'd by the Whale, both soul and body, and this in verity, that is truly and without fiction; yet he was not sensibly swallowd according to both, but according to his body only, & his soul is said to be sensibly swallow'd by means of the body, in which it was *in verity & without fiction*.

You reply, though *Jonas* his soul may be said to be sensibly swallow'd by means of his body in which it was, or by accident, yet it can no waies be said to be sensibly eaten or chew'd. Therefore though *Christs body* be in the Sacrament, yet it cannot be said to be sensibly chew'd or eaten in it, seeing the manner of its being is spiritual.

Answ. The disparity is, that *Ionas* was not chew'd or eaten either according to his soul or body; But *Christs body is sensibly chew'd or eaten in the Sacrament*, according to the Signs or Sacrament, though not according to its own substance.

Now let any impartial *Christian* judge what good meaning Doctor *Taylor* could have, in enumerating such a rabble of seeming contradictions, (which are indeed none) upon false imaginary suppositions: Or in exaggerating

ting ſuch an imminent danger, nay moral certainty, (if he may be our judge) of groſs and horrible Idolatry in our doctrine and worſhip of the B. Sacrament (the known and conſtant beliefe not only of this Nation, but the whole world, except ſome few Sectaries in the laſt Age, even from its firſt converſion to Chriſtianity:) What other end could he probably propoſe to himſelf (eſpecially in this conjuncture of time) then to lay his whole weight of malice upon perſons that live innocently by him, and who for their Religion, have already burthens enough to ſatisfie the uncharitableneſſe of any ordinary envy. He is one that pretends ſometimes to much moderation and charity in his writings: I wiſh he had them in his heart, but am ſure he hath ſhew'd neither in this Treatiſe; let him that judgeth all things be his judge; I only ſet this *Motto* on our *Tenet*, *Veritas in æternum ſtat*, and God can finde protection for his people, or if it be his wil to have us ſufferers for juſtice ſake, we know he wil reward our ſufferings with a moſt full and overflowing meaſure. His wil be done: *Amen.*

Article

ARTICLE XII.

Of Communion under one kind.

OUr Tenet is, *That there is no neceſsity for the Laity to communicate under both kinds, but that it is lawfull for them to do it either under one or both, as the Church of God appoints*: which we prove thus.

The firſt Argument.

Ma. If to *communicate* under *one kind* only be ſufficient for the Laities obtaining everlaſting life; then it is not neceſſary for them to *communicate under both.*

Mi. But to *communicate under one kind only* is ſufficient for the Laities obtaining everlaſting life:

Conſ. Therefore it is not neceſſary for them to *communicate under both.*

The *major* is proved; Becauſe that, without which a thing may be had, is not abſolutely neceſſary for obtaining it.

The *minor* is proved by, *This is a bread coming down from heaven, that if any one eat of it, he dies not*, S. John 6.50. *He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever*, verſ. 52. *If any one eateth me, the ſame ſhall alſo live by me*, verſ. 58. You hear *eating* only will ſuffice.

A ſecond Argument.

1. If Chriſt himſelf and his Diſciples gave the Sacrament under one kind, then it is lawful alſo for us to give it under one kind.
2. But Chriſt himſelf and his Diſciples did ſomtimes give it under one kind:
3. Therfore it is lawful alſo for us to give it under one kind.

The *major* is manifeſt, becauſe their actions are our examples and beſt warrants.

The *minor* is proved: *And it came to paſſe whileſt he* (Chriſt) *ſate at the table with them, he took bread, and bleſſed, and brake and did reach it to them, and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vaniſhed out of their ſight*, S. Luke laſt, verſe 30.

And they were perſevering in the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and the communication of the breaking of bread and prayer, Acts 2.v.42. *And in the firſt of the Sabbath, when they were aſſembled to break bread*, &c. Acts 20.17. A plain *Synaxis*; Here is no cup in any of theſe places, which

are

are all expounded of the Sacrament, by S. *Austin*, *l.* 49. *de consens. Evangel. c.* 25. *Venerable Bede*, and *Theophylact* on the said places.

A Third Argument.

1. If the whole substance and essence of the Saerament with all the ends thereof be had under one kinde, both are not necessary to salvation.
2. But the whole substance and essence of the Sacrament with all the ends thereof, is had under on kinde.

Therefore both are not necessary to salvation.

The *major* is proved, because the precise institution of a thing infers not a necessity of doing or receiving the whole, when the end of the institution may be obtained by a part only; for example; God instituted all kinds of meats for mans sustenance, yet neither any one particular man, nor the whole collection of men are bound to eat all kinds of meates, but so much only as is sufficient to sustaine them; so God ordain'd marriage for the holy propagation of mankinde, yet all men are not bound to marry, because mankinde may sufficiently be propagated without this or that particular mans marrying.

The *minor* is proved, because, under one

kinde, there is the matter, the bread, there is the forme, the words of conſecration; there is the ſigne of Chriſts unity with the faithfull, many graines making one paſte; there is the thing ſignified, the body and blood of Chriſt and divine grace, there is a memory of his death and paſſion, the bread divided from the cup, to ſignifie how his body and blood were divided for us on the croſs, and hence it was that after the conſecration of either kinde, he recommended to us the memory of his death and paſſiion; to ſhew that either was a ſufficient memorial thereof, 1. *Cor.* 11. 24. 25. And finally by receiving under one kind we are ſpiritually nouriſhed, made partakers of the merits of Chriſt, and faſt united to him. *For We are one bread, one body, all that do participate of one bread,* 1 *Cor.* 10. 13. which is all that appertains to the ſubſtance, eſſence, or ends of of this Sacrament.

A fourth Argument.

1. That which is not commanded either in the written, or unwritten Word of God, is no divine precept.
2. But the Laities Communion under both kinds is not commanded either in the written or unwritten Word of God.

Therefore the Laities Communion under both kinds is no divine precept; and 'tis lawful for

for them to communicate under one, or both, according as the Church appoints.

The *major* is manifeſt by the very termes.

The *minor* is proved by the ſolution of all ſuch objections as ſhall be brought out of the Scripture to the contrary: And as for the unwritten Word, which is Apoſtolicall Tradition, let theſe enſuing teſtimonies be heard.

Fathers for this point.

In the ſecond Age S. *Dionyſius* afferts the Communion of Infants under one kind, *l. de Eccleſ. Hierarch c. ult. prope finem.* See alſo *c.* 4.

In the third Age *Tertullian* tels us, it was then a cuſtome to carry the Euchariſt home to their houſes for private Communion (*l. ad Uxorem*) which could be done but under one kind, becauſe Chalices were not permitted to be in Lay-mens houſes. S. *Athanaſius Apol. 2. cont. Arianos.*

In the ſame Age S. *Cyprian* affirms, it was given to Infants and to the Sick in one kind only. *Serm. de lapſis num.* 10.

In the fourth Age S. *Ambroſe* afferts. They kept the Euchariſt after conſecration, and that his brother *Satyrus* in a ſhipwrack was miraculouſly delivered from the waters, by having the Euchariſt tied about his neck in a ſtole. *Orat. de obitu Satyri.*

In the ſame Age *Euſebius* teſtifies; They were wont to ſend the Sacrament by Sea into far countries, *l.5. Hiſtor.* which could not be done but under one kind.

In the fifth Age S. *Auſtin* teaches the practice of communion under one kind for infants. *L. adverſ. Julian. Pelag. c. 4. prope finem. & tom. 2. Epiſt. 106. poſt medium.*

In the ſame Age it was ſo indifferent a thing for the Laity to communicate either under one or both kinds, that the *Manichees* (who held Chriſt had no true bloud, and that wine was the gall of the Devil, and therfore would not receive the cup) lurked among Catholikes, by communicating under the form of bread only, and could not be diſtinguiſhed from them, till Pope *Leo* the firſt made a ſpecial Edict, commanding all the Laity to receive once a year under both kinds, and that at the publike Communion of Eaſter, by which means he detected the ſaid *Manichees*, and excluded them from the Catholike Communion. See *Leo Serm. 4 de Quadrageſ.* and *Baronius Annals An. 490. num. 21, 22.*

The Council of *Claremont* under Pope *Urban. 2.* decreed againſt an abuſive cuſtome of dipping the bread in the cup, *That no man ſhould communicate of the Altar, unleſſe he took the bread apart, and the cup in like manner; unleſſe through neceſſity or caution* (as in caſe of ſick and

and infants) *Can.*28. *An. Dom.*1095.

The Council of *Conſtance* has decreed againſt all ſuch as raſhly preſume to ſay, *That Chriſtian people ought to receive the Sacrament under both kinds*, &c. *That as the cuſtome of the Layties receiving under the form of bread onely, had [been lawfully brought in for avoiding ſome dangers and ſcandalls, and very long obſerved* &c. *ſo it ought to be held for a Law, which it is not lawfull to reject, without the Churches authority. Seſs.* 13.14. *An. Dom* 1415. The Council of *Baſil* has defined the ſame, *Seſſ.*30.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. DRink *ye all of this*, S. Matth. 26. *Anſw.* That was only ſpoken to the Apoſtles, whom he made Prieſts, none elſe were preſent; *And they all drank*, S. Mark 14. That thoſe words concerned not the Layty, but the Apoſtles only. appears in S. *Luke*, who has expreſt it thus; *Take ye and d vide it amongſt you*, S. Luke 22.17.

Ob. *Do this for a commemo ation of me*, S Luke c.22. 1 Cor.11.

Anſw. By thoſe words Chriſt made his Apoſtles Prieſts, and gave them power to conſecrate his *Body* & *Bloud*, as he had there done, which cannot appertain to the Laity; unleſſe perhaps you would have them Prieſts alſo, and

then we ſhall have Prieſts enough. Beſides, S. *Luke* has thoſe words after the conſecration of the bread immediatly, not after the conſecration of the Cup, & S. *Paul* has them abſolutely after the conſecration of the bread, but conditionally onely after the conſecration of the cup, and with limitation *Do this as oft as ye ſhall drink, in commemoration of me*, both which circumſtances rather evince a non-neceſſity of communion under both kinds, then otherwiſe.

Ob. Chriſt ordained it in both kinds.

Anſw. True; but preciſe inſtitution, as hath been proved, obliges not all men to do all that was inſtituted: Beſides, it was inſtituted not only for a Sacrament, but a ſacrifice; and ſo I grant both kinds are requiſite to make a perfect repreſentation of the body and bloud of Chriſt, as actually divided on the croſs; and therfore Prieſts have a command to receive it both kinds, but not the Laity, to whom it appertains not to ſacrifice.

Ob. *Unleſſe ye eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his blond, you ſhall have no life in you.*

Anſw. Such as deny the reall preſence of Chriſts body in the Eucharift, ſay, that Chapter concerns not oral and ſacramental, but only mental, and ſpiritual communion; and ſo nothing to your purpoſe. But to ſuch as allow the real preſence with us, I anſwer, This imports a command obliging the whole Church,

Church, but not each particular man, and ſo it is fulfilled by the whole Church, by Prieſts receiving in both kinds, and by the Laity receiving in one, or both, as it is appointed.

It is not ſaid, *unleſſe every one*, &c. but *unleſſe ye eat*, &c. So when Chriſt ſaid, *Go ye teaching all nations, baptizing them*, &c. he did not command every particular Apoſtle to teach and baptize all Nations (that were impoſſible) but that it ſhould be done among them, according to their ſeveral allotments. So in the old Scripture we read, *Ye ſhall circumciſe the fleſh of your fore-skin*, Gen. 17. 11. *And let every one take a lamb* &c. *the Whole multitude of the ſons of Iſrael ſhall ſacrifice it*, *Exod.* 12. 3, 6. Theſe were precepts obliging the whole Synagogue, but not each particular man; every one was not bound to circumciſe, but ſuch only as were deputed for that office; nor was every one obliged to ſacrifice the lamb, but only the father or chief of every family. The reaſon of this is given us by S. *Auſtin*, *Becauſe the morall precepts of Chriſt oblige all and each particular man of the ſame ſtate or calling his ſacramental precepts not ſo; but the Whole multitude onely, according to their different callings and capacities.* That nothing can be proved out of this Chapter, for the neceſſity of communion in both kinds, is evident, becauſe in three or foure ſpeciall texts it affirms one kind

kind to be ſufficient to ſalvation, *verſe* 50, 52, 58.

Ob. *Let a man prove himſelf, and ſo let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup, for he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himſelf*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. You hear S. *Paul* injoyns both.

Anſw. This probation, or trial of our ſelves is neceſſary for all ſorts of men, and at all times, as often as they communicate, and therfore he extends his ſpeech to all, as wel Prieſts as Laicks; That he knew it to be lawful for the Laity to receive under one kind onely (if holy Church ſhould ſo command) is evident by the precedent verſe, in which he ſayes, For *whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, or drink this cup of our Lord unworthily*, (the Greek word is ἀναξίως) *he ſhall be guilty of the body and bloud of our Lord*, verſ. 27. And after the conſecration of the bread he ſayes abſolutely, *Do this for a commemoration of me:* But after the conſecration of the cup, he ſayes, *Do ye this* (not abſolutely, but with a limitation) *as often as ye ſhall drink, for a commemoration of me*, verſ. 26. ſo to intimate, that it was not neceſſary for all ſorts of Communicants, or at all times, to receive the cup.

Ob. By denying them the cup, you rob the Laity of the bloud of Chriſt.

Anſw. No; there is both body and bloud, whole

whole Chriſt under either kind : his body and bloud cannot be now divided ; for he is now immortal and impaſſible, he cannot die nor ſuffer any more, *Rom.6.* And as the Church heretofore commanded the Laity to receive in both kinds, ſo to exclude the *Manichees* (*who held the cup to be unlawfull, and not the bloud of Chriſt, but the gall of the Devil*) from the communion of the faithful ; ſo now ſhe commands them to receive under the form of bread only, to exclude and detect ſuch heretikes as hold that whole Chriſt is not under either kind.

Ob. The cup is the Legacie of Chriſt to his Church, and therfore belongs to all.

Anſw. No, it is a part of his Will or Teſtament, and the Will is not his Legacy. His Legacy was everlaſting life. *That being juſtified by grace We may be heires according to hope of everlaſting life, Rom.* 8. 17. Or if you will needs have the cup a Legacy, at leaſt it was but a part of his Legacy, and appertains not to all by any precept or neceſſity, but to thoſe onely to whom the Overſeers of his Will (the Paſtors of the Church) have been appointed to deliver it.

Ob. S. *Cyprian* ſays, *The Law forbids the eating of bloud, the Goſpel commands it*, de Cœna Dom.

Anſ. This is againſt, not for you. He ſpeaks of eating, not of drinking; if you will have it under-

underſtood of drinking, I anſwer, it commands Prieſts, but not the Laity.

Ob. S. *Auſtin* ſayes, *All that will have life are exhorted to drink bloud*, q. 57. in Levit.

Anſw. Counſel is no command, and you muſt note here, that whenſoever the Fathers ſay the Laity have a right to the cup, & ought to receive it, they ſpeak of times in which the Church ſo appointed and commanded, which is not againſt us.

Ob. The Prieſt receiving in both kinds, receives but one whole Sacrament: Therefore both kinds belong to the integrity of the Sacrament.

Anſw. I grant the antecedent, but diſtinguiſh the conſequence, therfore both kinds belong to the integrity of the Sacrament, and make but one whole Sacrament, when they are taken together, and ordered to one refection, I grant; of neceſſity, always, or when they are taken apart, I deny. For ſo either kind is an entire and perfect Sacrament of it ſelf. So many diſhes of meat, if eaten of together & ordered to one refreſhing, make but one meal, but eaten of at ſeveral times, and ordered to divers refections, they make ſeveral whole meales. Chriſt ordained both kinds, and left it in the power of his Church, to make them one or two diſtinct matters of the Sacrament, as the neceſſity of times and perſons ſhould require.

Article

ARTICLE XIII.

Of the unbloudy Sacrifice of the Maſſe.

EXternal Sacrifice, properly ſo called, is a worſhip that belongs to none but God; and hence it is, the Devil has been long endeavouring, by Heretikes and Sectaries, utterly to aboliſh the Maſſe, (the daily ſacrifice of Chriſtians) which Antichriſt in the later dayes ſhall take away, *Dan.* 11.31. The thing offered and ſacrificed in the Maſſe, we have already demonſtrated to be the body and bloud of Jeſus Chriſt, true God and man, under the outward forms of bread and wine. And, for the action, by which it is ſacrificed to God, which chiefly is diſcuſs'd in this Article, you are to note,

1. That by the word *Sacrifice* in this place we underſtand not a ſacrifice in general, or improperly ſo termed (ſuch as are all the actions of the mind, or any work of vertue whatſoever) but a ſpecial ſacrifice, truly and properly ſo called.

2. That

2. That the ſacrifice of the croſs is an abſolute, bloudy, and general ſacrifice, propitiatory for the ſins of the whole world, but the ſacrifice of the laſt Supper, or the Maſſe, is a repreſentative, unbloudy, and particular ſacrifice, applying the ſaid general and bloudy ſacrifice to us.

OUr Tenet is, *That the oblation of our Lords laſt Supper, or the Maſſe, is a true and proper unbloudy ſacrifice, and propitiatory for ſins.*

The firſt Argument.

1. A commemorative ſacrifice is the oblation of a ſenſible thing made to God, teſtifying (by force of divine inſtitution) the ſupreme dominion of God, and paſſion of Chriſt.
2. But Chriſt at his laſt Supper (and the ſame is done in the Maſſe) made the oblation of a ſenſible thing to God, teſtifying (by force of his divine inſtitution) the ſupreme dominion of God, and his own death and paſſion.
3. Therfore Chriſt at his laſt Supper (and the ſame is done in the Maſſe) offered a true and proper commemorative ſacrifice.

The *major* is manifeſt of it ſelf, and allowed by all.

The

The *minor* is proved; becauſe Chriſt at his laſt Supper made the oblation of his body and bloud to God for us, under the viſible formes of bread and wine. *This is my body* (ſaith he) *which is given for you*, S. *Luke* 22.19. He did not ſay, *Which is given to you* (though he alſo gave it to them a Sacrament) but *which is given for you*; (to ſhew, he firſt offered it to God for them, a ſacrifice.) *This is my bloud which is ſhed for many to the remiſſion of ſins*, S. *Matth.* 26: 28. It repreſents the ſupreme dominion of God, becauſe the things offered are broken, ſhed and deſtroid, according to the outward formes; to ſhew his power over life and death. It teſtifieth the paſſion of Chriſt by force of his own inſtitution; *Do ye this* (ſaith he) *for a commemoration of me*, S. Luke 22.

A ſecond Argument.

1. *Chriſt is a Prieſt for ever according to the order of Melchiſedech*, Heb.7.11,15,17.
2. But the order of *Melchiſedech's* Prieſthood conſiſted principally in this, That he offered to God the pacifick and unbloudy ſacrifice of bread and wine.
3. Therefore Chriſt at his laſt Supper offered to God the pacifick and unbloudy ſacrifice of bread and wine.

The

The *minor* (which only requires proof) is proved; *And Melchisedech King of Salem brought forth bread and wine, and he was sacrificing to the most high God, Gen.* 14.18. The Hebrew word is *Cohen Leel*, which word *Cohel* (as often as it is joyned with a Dative case in holy Scripture, as it is here) signifies the Participle *sacrificing*, and not the Substantive, a *Sacrificer*.

The consequence is confirmed, because a similitude in the rite of sacrificing is that which chiefly pertaines to the similitude of Priesthood.

A third Argument.

1. To offer God a propitiatory sacrifice, is nothing else, but to offer an Host to God for the remission of sins.
2. But Christ at his last Supper offered an Host to God for the remission of sins, as I have proved:

Therefore Christ at his last Supper (and the same is done in the Masse) offered a propitiatory sacrifice.

A fourth Argument.

1. What Christ did in the oblation of his last Supper, he gave his Apostles and their suc-

ſucceſſors both power and command to do.

2. But Chriſt in the oblation of his laſt Supper offered to God a true and proper commemorative, and unbloudy ſacrifice: (as hath been proved by the firſt and ſecond Arguments:)

3. Therfore he gave his Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors (that is, all lawful Prieſts) both power and command to offer unto God a true and proper commemorative, and unbloudy ſacrifice.

The *major* is proved, *Do ye this* (which I have done) *for a commemoration of me*, S. *Luke* 22. 1 *Cor.* 11. How long this power was to laſt, and this command to be in force, S. *Paul* has taught us, *As often as ye ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye ſhall declare the death of our Lord untill he come*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. which words have been expounded by three general Councils, to ſignifie, that we do not worthily eat the bread, & drink the cup of our Lord, unleſs we firſt denounce his death, by the conſecration and unbloudy ſacrificing of his body and bloud. 1. Epheſine, 2. Chalcedon, 3. Conſtantinopolitan Councils.

The conſequence is eſtabliſhed, becauſe Chriſt could not be truly called *Prieſt for ever according to the Order of Melchiſedech*, (*Pſal.* 109. *Heb.* 5. 10. & *Heb.* 6. *v. laſt*) unleſs he had ordain'd ſome unbloudy ſacrifice, which was to

last to the end of the world, and to be offered by inferior Priests, subordinate to, and succeeding him in his unbloudy Priesthood; seeing his bloudy Priesthood ceased at his death; neither could that return after his resurrection, because it was incompatible with his immortality.

Add to this that of *Malachy* 1.10,11. *From the rising of the Sun, even to the setting, great is my name amongst the Gentiles, and there is sacrificed and offered to my name in every place a clean oblation.* The Hebrew word is *Mincha*, which in Scripture alwayes signifies (when offered unto God) a proper and unbloudy sacrifice; and cannot otherwise be verified, then by the Priesthood of the new Law, and the unbloudy sacrifice of the Mass; without which having taken away all the sacrifices of the old Law, Christ had not increased, but diminished his Fathers honor. Thus the Doctors and Fathers of the Church proved the eternity of our Saviours Priesthood, against the Jews, which Sectaries indeavour to rob him of.

Fathers for this point.

IN the first Age S. *Andrew*; *I daily sacrifice an immaculate lamb to almighty God, Who (when he is truly sacrificed, and his flesh truly eaten) remains whole and alive.* In the book of S. *Andrew's*

drew's passion, written by his own disciples, with *Surius*.

In the same Age S. *Ignatius*, S. *Peters* Scholar; *They* (the Saturnian Heretikes) *admit not* (saith he) *of Eucharists and oblations; because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour, who suffered for our sins.* In Epist. ad Smirnæum citat. apud Theodoret. Dial. 3.

In the second Age *Irenæus*; *How can they be assured, the bread in which thanks are given* (a pacifick sacrifice) *is made the body of our Lord, and the chalice his blood, if they acknowledge him not to be the Son of the maker of the world?* lib. 4. cap. 57.

In the third Age *Origen*; *You think your selves guilty, and worthily, if any part of the consecrated Host be lost through your negligence.* Homil. 13. in Exod.

In the fourth Age *Epiphanius*; *Never shall you find our Lord or his Apostles, or the Fathers say, that the unbloody sacrifice which is offered by the Priests is an image, but his very body and blood.* In disputat. cum S. Greg. in 7. Synod. generali action. 6. tom 3.

In the same Age S. *Chrysostome*; *The wisemen worshipped him in the manger, thou seest him not in the manger; but on the Altar, &c. and the Spirit abundantly powred out on the sacrifice presented there,* in 1. ad Cor. And in another place; *In regard it is offered in many places, be*

shore many Christs? No: for as he who is every where offered, is one body, and not many bodies, so the sacrifice is one. Homil. 17. in Epist. ad Heb.

In the same Age S. *Hierome*; *He is the inviter, and the banquet, we drink his bloud, &c. and in his sacrifices we daily presse ruddy sweet wines from the true grape.* Q. 2. Epist. ad Hædiber.

In the same Age S. *Ambrose*; *When we sacrifice Christ is present.* In cap. 1. S. Luc. And in another place; *Though Christ is not seen to offer now, yet he himself is offered on earth, when the body of Christ is offered, nay he himself is manifested to offer in us, whose speech doth sanctifie the sacrifice which is offered.* In Psalm. 38.

In the fifth age S. *Augustine*; *When now we see this sacrifice offered to God in every place by the Priesthood of Christ according to the order of Melchisedech, and the Jews sacrifice to cease, why do they yet expect another Christ?* Tom. 5. de civitat. Dei cap. 35. And (l. 9. Confess. c. 3.) he tells us, *His mother Monica desired on her death-bed, that memory should be made of her at the Altar, from whence shee knew the holy sacrifice to bee dispensed, wherewith the indictment against us was blotted out.*

The first Nicene Council decrees, *By faith let*

let us underſtand the Lamb of God, who taketh away the ſins of the World, to be placed on the ſacred Table, to be ſacrificed by the Prieſts unbloudily, &c. L. 3. Decret. de divina Menſa. An. Dom. 315.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. WHen Chriſt ſaid, *This is my body which is given for you. This is my bloud which is ſhed*, &c. He ſpake onely of what was given, and ſhed the day following on the Croſs.

Anſw. No; He ſpake of what he himſelf there gave and ſhed at his laſt Supper, commanding his Apoſtles to do the ſame, *Do ye this*, &c. They were not commanded to give his body or ſhed his bloud the day following on the croſs; the words are, *Which is given, which is ſhed*, in all the Greek and Syriack Bibles, as alſo in your Engliſh verſions. And S. *Paul* hath prevented that evaſion, by ſaying, *This is my body which is broken* (unbloudily ſacrificed) *for you*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. & S. *Luke* alſo by ſaying, *this is the chalice the new Teſtament in my bloud, which* (chalice) *is ſhed for you*, S. *Luke* 22. 20. So the Greek text hath it. His body was not broken on the croſs, (*They did not diminiſh any bone of him*, S. *John* c. 19.) but only at his laſt Supper under the outward form of bread;

neither was his bloud shed out of the cup on the cross, but only the night before, under the form of wine. This argument was used by S. *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact*, and *Ecumenius* above a thousand years ago, to prove the Mass a true unbloudy sacrifice, in 1 *Cor.* 10. 16.

Ob. The vulgar Latine Edition reads, *which shall be given or broken, which shall be shed.*

Answ. True; and this proves, that it was not only thus given and broken at his last Supper, but also to be given, broken, and shed by his Apostles and their successors, to the end of the world; which we acknowledge. This does not prejudice the Greek and Syriack texts.

Ob. Christs body is not broken in the Eucharist, nor his bloud shed.

Answ. Bloudily, visibly, or in its own form, I grant; unbloudily, representatively, and in the form of bread and wine, I deny. *The bread which we break, is it not a participation of the body of our Lord?* 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. and his bloud, as under the form of wine, was shed and powred out of the cup, in a sacramental and unbloudy way. A farther conviction of this verity is, because Christ at his last Supper instituted and sealed his last will and Testament. *This is the chalice, the new Testament in my bloud*, S. Luke 22. *This chalice is the new Testament in my bloud*, &c. 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. Now a Testament cannot

cannot be made betwixt God and man, without ſhedding of bloud. *Neither was the firſt* (Teſtament) *dedicated without bloud, Heb.* 9. 18. And again, *Without ſhedding of bloud there is no remiſſion*, verſ. 22. Therfore at his laſt Supper Chriſt ſhed his bloud, at leaſt in an unbloudy manner.

Ob. *Chriſt entred once by his own bloud into the Holies, eternal redemption being found*, Heb. 9. verſ. 12.

Anſw. True; he entred *once*, and but *once*, by his own bloud, bloudily ſhed, and to redeem us, but often by his own bloud ſhed unbloudily, and to apply the redemption to our ſoules. Firſt by himſelf at his laſt Supper, the reſt by his Miniſters on the Altar, where he ſacrificeth inviſibly, they viſibly; they as the inſtruments, he as the principal cauſe.

Ob. *If we ſin willingly after the knowledge of the truth received, now there is not an Hoſt for ſin, Heb.* 10. verſ. 26.

Anſw. He ſpeaks only there of ſuch as apoſtatize from the faith, and forſake the true Church, out of which there is no true ſacrifice: ſo all the Fathers expound this place, and this is not againſt us.

Ob. *Chriſt offered one Hoſt for ſins*, Heb. 10. 12. *By one oblation he hath conſummated for ever them that be ſanctified*, ver. 14.

Answ. The *Host* or *Oblation* is one and the same on the cross, and all the altars of the world, though the manner of offering be divers, there bloudy, here unbloudy; And whersoever S. *Paul* sayes, that *Christ offered himself once*, or *but once*, he apparently speaks of the bloudy offering, using the words θύω, and θυσία, which signifie a bloudy sacrifice, and to sacrifice bloudily.

Ob. If a living thing be sacrificed, it must be killed.

Answ. If it be sacrificed in its own proper form, I grant; if in the form of an inanimate thing (as the body of Christ is in the Eucharist) I deny.

Ob. The bloudy sacrifice was sufficient for all; therfore the unbloudy is superfluous.

Answ. I grant the antecedent, but deny the consequence. For though the bloudy sacrifice were sufficient for all, yet it is not efficient to all, unless it be applied to us by the unbloudy.

Ob. The Eucharist is a commemoration of the bloudy sacrifice; therefore not a sacrifice it self.

Answ. Your antecedent is true, but your consequence false. All the unbloudy sacrifices of the old Law were true and proper sacrifices themselves, and yet commemorations or representations of the unbloudy sacrifice of

of the laſt Supper, which was to come. The ſame thing in one time or circumſtance may commemorate and repreſent it ſelf as in another.

Ob. You equalize the ſacrifice of the Maſs, to the ſacrifice of the croſs.

Anſw. No, we do not, ſpeaking of the action of the ſacrifice; for we confeſs the ſacrifice of the croſs to be an abſolute ſacrifice, and propitiatory for the ſins of the whole world, in order to redemption; but the ſacrifice of the Maſs is only a particular repreſentative and applicatory ſacrifice, and hath its worth and efficacy from it.

Ob. Chriſt remains a Prieſt for ever: therefore all Prieſthood is tranſlated into him alone.

Anſw. I deny the conſequence; for he is not onely a Prieſt, but a high Prieſt for ever, according to the order of *Melchiſedech*; And therefore muſt have others under him, to the worlds end (as hath been proved) of the ſame order.

Ob. If Chriſt be a Prieſt for ever, he ſacrificeth for ever.

Anſw. Inviſibly, and by his ſubordinate Miniſters, I grant; ſo Chriſt baptizeth, teacheth, and governs the Church for ever, inviſibly, and by his Miniſters; by himſelf, I ſay, inviſibly, by them viſibly.

Ob.

Ob. S. *Paul* knew nothing of unbloudy sacrifice, otherwise doubtless he had mentioned it in his Epistle to the Hebrews.

Answ. Yes, he did; for he sayes the Priests offered for sins δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας (*Heb.*5.1. cap. 8.ver.3. c.9.v.9.) that is, *unbloudy and bloudy offerings.* And for the unbloudy sacrifice of the new Law, he hath given ample testimony in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, above cited. 'Tis true, in his Epistle to the Hebrews he did not dispute with the Jews concerning the unbloudy sacrifice of the new Law, because they would not yet believe the bloudy, and therfore it was requisite he should as yet conceal this greater mystery from them: this was the reason, why, speaking to them of Christ, as *high Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech,* he said, *Of whom we have great speech, and inexplicable to utter, because ye are become weak to hear,* Heb.5.11.

Ob. S. *Paul* proves, that the Jews sacrifice of expiation did not cleanse from all sin, and make the offerers thereof perfect, because it was repeated yearly. Therfore the sacrifice of the Mass which is so often repeated, is not propitiatory for sin.

Answ. I grant the antecedent: The Jews yearly sacrifice of expiation was not propitiatory for all sin past, present, and to come, as the sacrifice of the cross was, otherwise it could

could not need to have been yearly repeated, or to be offered more then once; yet I deny the conſequence; for though the ſacrifice of the Maſs be not propitiatory for ſins to come, or in order to redemption, yet it applies the ſacrifice of the croſs to us, and is propitiatory for ſins paſt, if truly ſorrowed for: and as we are daily prone to ſin, ſo need we a daily ſacrifice for ſin.

S. *Pauls* principal intent in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, was to ſhew the Jews, that no ſacrifice of the old Law was general, and propitiatory for all ſin, or able to reconcile the whole world to God, as the ſacrifice of the croſs was; ſo that it had been impertinent for him to have diſputed there of the unbloudy ſacrifice of the Maſs, which is not of ſuch univerſal force or efficacy.

Ob. Where there is remiſſion of ſins, now there is not an oblation for ſins, Heb. 10. 18.

Anſw. Where there is a general remiſſion of ſins, ſuch as was on the croſs, now there is not a general oblation for ſins, ſuch as was there made, I grant. Now there is not a particular and applicatory oblation for ſins, ſuch as is made in the Maſs, I deny. Or thus, now there is not a bloudy oblation for ſins, or with yearly change of the Hoſt, I grant: Now there is not an unbloudy oblation for ſins, made alwayes with one and the ſame Hoſt, I deny,

deny, and ſo doth S. *Paul*, ſaying in the perſon of Chriſt, *This is my body which is broken* (unbloudily ſacrificed) *for you*, &c. *Do ye this for a commemoration of me*, 1 Cor. 11.

Article XIV.

Of the Liturgie, and publike Prayer in an unknown Tongue.

OUr Tenet is, *That though it be not of divine command, yet it is good, lawfull and expedient for the Maſs, or publike Liturgie of the Church, to be in a Tongue not generally underſtood by the people*, proved thus.

The firſt Argument.

1. What the Apoſtles did and practiſed in this behalf, is good, lawful, and expedient for us to do and practiſe.

2. But

2. But their Liturgies were in ſacred languages, and ſuch as were not generally known by all the Nations they converted.
3. Therefore it is good, lawful, and expedient for our publike Liturgies to be in ſacred Languages & tongues not generally underſtood by all the Nations they are uſed in.

The *major* is evident of it ſelf.

The *minor* is proved, becauſe their publike Liturgies were all in Hebrew, Greek, Syriack, or Latine, as is manifeſt in Hiſtory, which were not the generally known languages of all, nor half the Nations by them converted. And the like argument holds in the Fathers of all ſucceeding ages, whoſe publike Liturgies were for the moſt part in Hebrew, Greek or Latine.

A ſecond Argument.

1. That which is prais'd in holy Scripture, and may be proved by Scripture to be both pleaſing to God, and profitable to our ſoules, is good, lawful, and expedient for us to practiſe.
2. But prayer in an unknown Tongue (ſpeaking in generall) is prais'd in holy Scripture, and may be proved by Scripture to be both pleaſing to God, and profitable to our ſoules.
3. Therefore prayer in an unknown Tongue (ſpeaking

(ſpeaking in general) is good, lawful, and expedient for us to practiſe.

The *major* is more evident then to need proof.

The *minor* is proved. *He that ſpeaketh with tongue* [unknown] *ſpeaketh not to men, but to God, for no man heareth, but in ſpirit he ſpeaketh myſteries*, 1 Cor. 14. 2. *I would have you to ſpeak with tongues, but rather to propheſie*, verſ. 5. *Thou indeed giveſt thanks well* [in an unknown tongue] *but the other is not edified*, verſ. 17. *If I pray with tongue* [unknown] *my ſpirit prayeth, but my underſtanding is without fruit*, ver. 14. *I will pray in the ſpirit* [in a tongue unkown] *and I will pray in the underſtanding* [in a tongue unknown] verſ. 15. *To ſpeak with tongues forbid ye not*, verſe 40. Why then are Sectaries ſo bold to do it?

A third Argument.

1. In matters of diſcipline and government, where God hath commanded nothing, the command of the Church ought to be followed and obeyed.

2. But God hath commanded nothing concerning the language of the publike Liturgie:

3. Therefore as to the language of the publike Liturgie, the command of the Church ought

ought to be followed and obey'd, which ordains it to be in sacred languages.

The *major* is proved, because, under God, she is our chief Mistris, Lady, and Governess. *If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the Heathen, and the Publican*, S. Matth. 18. 18.

The *Minor* shall be proved by the solution of Objections.

Fathers for this point.

IN the second Age S. *Dionysius* tells us, *The sacred mysteries were kept secret from the common people*, *Eccles. Hierarch. c.* 1. A certain proof they were not celebrated in the common languages of the people.

In the third Age S. *Cyprian* testifies, *the publique Liturgie was in Latin*, In Exposit. Orationis Domin. num. 13.

In the fourth Age S. *Hierom* affirms, *All the Eastern Church was served in Greek, and used* S. Basils *Greek Liturgie*. Præfat in Paralip.

In the fifth Age S. *Augustine* witnesses, *That all the Western Church was served in Latin, and used the Latin Liturgie*. De don. perse. c. 13. de Doct. Christian. l. 2. c. 13. in Psal. 123. & Epist. 173.

Objections

Objections solved.

Ob. *IF I come to you speaking with tongues* [unknown] *what shall it profit you?* 1 Cor. 14. 6. And again, *If then I know not the vertue of the voice, I shall be to him to whom I speak barbarous, and he that speaketh barbarous to me*, verſ. 11. And a third time, *So you alſo ſpeaking with a tongue, unleſs you utter manifeſt ſpeech, how ſhall that be known that is ſaid, for you ſhall be ſpeaking into the ayre?* verſ. 9.

Anſw. S. *Paul* in thoſe places ſpeaks only againſt the publike uſe of ſtrange tongues miraculouſly inſpired, and not intelligible, but by the ſpecial gift of interpretation, not againſt tongues gotten by induſtry, and wel underſtood by the more learned ſort of all Nations, ſuch as Greek and Latine are: Beſides, he only ſpeaks there againſt ſpeech addreſſed to the people by way of exhortation, and inſtruction, in ſtrange tongues, not againſt ſpeech in unknown tongues, which is addreſſed to God only by way of prayer, ſuch as the publike Liturgie is; that he allowes, at leaſt in general termes, as you have heard. That this is *S. Pauls* ſcope and mind, appears partly by the very texts objected; for it followes in the firſt of them, *What ſhall I profit you, unleſs I ſpeak to you in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecie,*

prophecy, *or in doctrine*, verſ. 6. And a little before, *For he that prophecieth ſpeaks to men*, *unto edification*, *and exhortation*, *and inſtruction*, verſ. 3. So that this makes nothing againſt us.

Ob. *He that ſpeaketh with tongue* (uknown) *let him pray that he may interpret*; the ſame Epiſt. v. 13.

Anſw. This concerns neither prayer, nor the publike Liturgie, but exhortation; and if it did concern prayer, our anſwer would be, Our publike Liturgie is well underſtood by all the Prieſts, and well interpreted for the Laity, word by word, many hundred years ago.

Ob. *If thou bleſs in ſpirit* (a tongue unknown) *he that ſupplieth the place of the vulgar*, *how ſhall he ſay* Amen? *Becauſe he knowes not what thou ſaiſt*, 1 Corinth. ch. 14. ver. 16.

Anſw. He ſpeaks there only againſt extemporarie prayer in an unknown tongue, and that not interpreted, not againſt ſet form of prayer in an unknown tongue (ſuch as the publike Liturgie is) and that expounded and approved by the Church; to this the Clark may boldly ſay *Amen*. Let him explicate his own meaning: *He that ſpeaketh with*

tongue, let him pray that he may interpret, vers. 13. *And if there be no interpreter, let him hold his peace in the Church, and let him speak to God and himself*, vers. 28. This is not our case, our publike Liturgie hath many great and good Interpreters. Our exhortation and instruction of the people, as also our extemporary prayer, addressed to them before Sermons, or after, is alwayes in the knowne, and common Language of the people.

And for your better apprehension of the grand abuse of Protestants, in urging these texts to the people, against the publike Liturgie in an unknown tongue, please to note,

First, There is not any one text or word in all that chapter, concerning the publike Liturgie, or set form of prayer, which is addressed to God onely, but meerly concerning exhortation and instruction of the people, and extemporary prayer addressed to them in an unknown tongue: that, and only that is there forbidden, not absolutely, but with limitation, *If there be no Interpreter.*

Note secondly, That the Laity in our Church are not commanded to pray in an unknown tongue, but have their Offices and Devotions in their own vulgar Language, and

and such as will, may also have the Mass translated for them, and pray in the same words with the Priest; what then is here to be complained of? By keeping the Liturgie in the sacred Languages (which are the same in all ages) it hath been kept free from the corruptions, and mutability of other common Languages; so that the whole Church is able to judge of her own Liturgie, when any differences arise about it, which otherwise it could not.

ARTICLE XV.

Of Sacramentall Confeſſion, and Abſolution.

OUr Tenet is, *That true, and lawfully ordained Prieſts have a power from God to binde, and looſe from ſins, and that the Laity are obliged to confeſs their ſins to them, as alſo the Prieſts themſelves to one another.*

The Argument.

1. If the Apoſtles were made ſpiritual Judges by Chriſt our Lord, and had a power from him to binde and looſe from ſin, it followes by a neceſſary ſequel, that the Laity were obliged to confeſs their ſins to them.
2. But the Apoſtles were made ſpiritual Judges by Chriſt our Lord, and had a power from him to bind and looſe from ſin.

3. There-

3. Therefore the Laity were obliged to confeſs their ſins to them. And the ſame argument holds in their Succeſſors, that is, all true, and lawfully ordained Prieſts.

The *major* is proved; Becauſe the very inſtitution and inveſture of a power of Judicature in Superiors, inferres a neceſſary command to all inferiours, of giving obedience to ſuch power, otherwiſe the inſtitution and inveſture were altogether vain and idle, neither could they abſolve them from what they knew not.

The *minor* is proved; *Amen I ſay to you, Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on earth, it ſhal be bound alſo in heaven, and whatſoever ye ſhall looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven*, S Matth. 18. ver. 18. There he made them Judges. *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins ye ſhall forgive they are forgiven, and Whoſe ſins ye ſhall retain they are retained*, S. John 20. ver. 23. There he gave them commiſſion to remit ſins. S. *Paul* gives teſtimony to his Maſter, ſaying; *God hath given us the miniſtry of reconciliation, and hath put in us the Word of reconciliation; for Chriſt therefore are we Legates*, 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20.

Add to this the figures of the old Law, *The judgment of the Leproſie, which was a type of ſin, was committed to Prieſts onely*, Levit. 13. 14.

The conſequence is confirmed: *Confeſs your ſins to one another*, S. James 5. 16. And *if we confeſs our ſins, he is faithful and juſt to forgive us our ſins*, 1 John 1. 9. You heare confeſſion is a neceſſary condition.

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond Age S. *Clement*; *But if perhaps envy, or infidelity, or any other evill have crept ſubtilely into any ones heart, let him, that hath a care of his ſoule, not bluſh to confeſs theſe things to him that rules him, that he may be cured of him by the word of God* (that is, the words of abſolution inſtituted by Chriſt) *and good counſel.* And again *S. Peter taught us to break the evil thoughts coming to our hearts upon Chriſt, & to manifeſt them to the Prieſts of our Lord*, Epiſt. 1, 2.

In the third Age *Tertullian* reprehends thoſe *who for humane baſhfulneſs neglected to confeſs their ſins*, l. de pœnitent.

In the third Age *Origen*; *There is by penance the remiſſion of ſins, when he waſheth his bed with teares, and blaſheth not to ſhew his ſin to the Prieſt of our Lord.* Hom. 2. in Levit. And again, *Peter and Paul, and all ſuch as have been placed in the Church after the Apoſtles, are alſo Phyſitians, to whom the diſcipline of curing wounds hath been committed, &c. becauſe God wills not the death of ſinners, but their repentance.* Hom. 1. in Pſal. 37.

S. *Cyprian* in the ſame age, *Let every one of*

you

you, I beseech you brethren, confess his sin, whilest he is yet in this life, whilest his confession may be admitted, whilest every one's satisfaction and remission made by the Priest is grateful with our Lord. Tract. de lapsis.

In the fourth Age S. *Athanasius*; *If thy bonds are not yet loosed, commend thy self to the Disciples of Christ; for there be those that can absolve thee, by the power they received from our Savior, when he said, Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.* Serm. in illa verba, Invenietis pullum.

In the same Age S. *Ambrose*; *Confess freely to the Priest the hidden secrets of thy soule and shew them, as thou wouldest thy hidden wounds to thy Physitian.* Orat. in mulierem peccatricem.

In the same Age S. *Hierome*, *As there* (in the old Law) *the Priest makes the leprous person clean, or unclean, so here the Bishop or Priest bindeth or looseth.* in c. 16. Matth.

In the fifth Age S. *Augustine*: *Our God, because he is pious and mercifull, will have us confess our sins in this world, that we may not be confounded for them in the next,* Homil. 12. And again, *If murther be committed by a Catechumen, it is washed away by baptism; if by one baptized, it needs penance and reconciliation.* l. 2. de adulterinis conjug. c 16.

The first Cabilon Council hath defined, *That their confession being made, Penance be injoyned to penitents by Priests,* Can. 8. above 1000. years ago.

The Council of *Florence* defined *Penance to be a Sacrament, and that the effect of it is absolution from sin.* Decret. super Union. Jacobin. & Armen. An. Dom. 1431.

The 3 Council of *Carthage* decreed, *That the time of Penance should be appointed penitents by the arbitrement of the Bishop, according to the difference of their sins.* Can. 31. 1100. years ago.

Objections solved.

Ob. CHrist gave the power to absolve from sins, to none but his Apostles.

Answ. He gave it immediately to them, and in them to their lawful successors, as he did also the power to preach and baptize. *Go ye teaching all nations, baptizing them*, &c. was said immediately to none but the Apostles, but mediately to all true Priests: And so was that, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven.*

Ob. Who can forgive sins but only God?

Answ. 'Twas the Jewes objection against Christ, S. *Mark* 2. which he confuted with a miracle, by healing the Paralitique, to prove that he had power even as man to remit sins: and would bestow this power on men: For *the multitude glorified God, who had given such power to men* (viz. in and through Christ) S. *Matth.* 9. 8. 'Tis true, none but God can forgive sins

of

of himself, or by his own proper power, mans power in this being only ministerial, and delegated from Christ.

Object. *Come unto me all ye that labour*, S. Matth. 11.

Answ. In vain pretend they to come to Christ, who refuse to come to his Ministers, and to make use of such means as he appointed for our coming to him, amongst which sacramental confession and Priestly absolution from our sins is not the least, as hath been proved. Some have rejected baptism on the same score, but such as really intend to come to Christ, must not neglect or slight his constitutions.

Ob. Pope *Innocent* the third was the first that ordained auricular confession.

Answ. Christ himself ordained it, nor had it ever otherwise been possible to have persuaded the world to it: *Innocent* only determined the time of confession to be at Easter, or thereabouts. The *Iacobites An. Dom.* 600. which was six hundred years before his time, were condemned for holding, men ought to confess their sins to God; and that confession to a Priest was not necessary.

Ob. You think then the Priest can save your and pardon your sins without Christ.

An. I doubt you wilfully mistake: we think & know the Priest is able to do nothing in order

to

to it, but as the Minister, and through the merits of Christ, and by commission received from him.

Ob. At least you believe, though your sins be never so great and enormous, if you do but onely confess them to a Priest, all is well again.

Answ. You are again in an uncharitable mistake; we believe, and are taught, that not only a faithful and sincere confession of our sins to a Priest, but also hearty grief and sorrow for them, with a stedfast purpose of amendment, and a desire to make all possible satisfaction (by doing such penance as shall in the Sacrament be injoyned us) is requisite for the remission of them; and that if any of these things be wanting, as well our confession, as his absolution, is of no validity

Ob. What needs all this, when the Pope for a little money can give you a pardon to commit what sins you list for forty or a hundred years together?

Answ. You slander very much: the Pope has no such power, nor did he ever yet pretend to it: might he have all the kingdoms of the earth for doing it, he could not warrant us to commit any one sin, we should deride such pardons, should he offer them, and look on them as horrid blasphemies. The pardons you aim at, are only *Indulgences*, which con-

cern not the remission of sins, but only the release of Canonical penances, or temporal punishments due to such sins, as have already been remitted by penance and contrition.

Ob. We do not read the Apostles exacted auricular confession of any.

Answ. Nor do we read they absolved any, yet they did both, we have an Apostolical Tradition for it: otherwise they made void the Ordinance of Christ, or gave the mad man absolution, by absolving from they knew not what: and that, I hope, you will not charge them with.

Ob. Christs passion is sufficient for all.

Answ. True, but not efficient, unless applied, and this is one effectual means of doing it.

Article

Article XVI.

Of Purgatory.

OUr Tenet is, *That there is a third place of temporall puniſhment, where ſome ſoules are purged and puniſhed after this life*; which we prove thus.

The Argument.

1. By Purgatory we only underſtand a penal priſon, or place of temporal puniſhment and payment after this life.
2. But there is ſuch a penal priſon, or place of temporal puniſhment and payment after this life.
3. Therfore there is a Purgatory.

The *major* is evident, by the Churches declaration of her own meaning in it.

The *minor* is proved; *Thou alſo in the bloud of thy Teſtament haſt let forth thy priſoners out of the lake wherein there is not water*, Zach. 9. 11. (He ſpeaks of Chriſt) *He ſhall ſit as purging fire, and ſhall purge the ſons of Levi*, Mal. c. 3.

The

The work of every man ſhall be manifeſt, for the day of our Lord will declare it, becauſe it will be revealed in fire, and the work of every one of what ſort it is the fire ſhall trie; if any mans work abide, he ſhall receive a reward (as Innocents, and Martyrs, and perfect Chriſtians do, who go immediately to heaven) *if any ones worke burne, he ſhall ſuffer loſs, but himſelf ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire*, 1 Cor. 3. 13.14.15. See a purging and puniſhing, yet ſaving fire: *Be at agreement with thy adverſary betimes, whileſt thou art on the way* (in this life) *with him, leſt thy adverſary deliver thee to the Judg, and the Judge deliver thee to the Gealer, and thou be caſt into priſon, Amen, I ſay to thee, thou ſhale not go out from thence, till thou repay the laſt farthing*, S. Matth. 5. 27. (A place of payment, and yet delivery at length.) *Some ſins ſhall neither be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come*, S. Matth. 12. 32. Therefore ſome, according to our Saviour, are forgiven in the world to come, to wit, venial ſins.

That the guilt of temporal puniſhment may and doth ſomtimes remain after the guilt of ſin is pardoned, and the eternal puniſhment remitted, is proved by theſe examples of holy Scripture. Firſt by *Adam*, who was caſt *out of paradiſe* for ever, and had his whole poſterity puniſhed with concupiſcence, death, and many other miſeries, after his ſin of

disobedience was forgiven him, by meanes of that only sin. Secondly, By *David*, whose sin of adultery was punished *with the death of his child*, after his sin had been remitted, 2 Kings 12. Thirdly, By *Mary*, *Moses* his sister, who after her sin had been forgiven her, was injoyn'd a penance for it of seven dayes, *Numb.* 12. *O King* (saith Daniel) *redeem thy sins with alms*, c.4. *Do ye the worthy fruits of penance*, S.Luke 3.8.

Fathers for this point.

IN the second Age *Tertullian*; *Seeing we understand that prison which the Gospel demonstrates to be plainly below, and the last farthing we interpret every small fault there to be punished, by the delay of the resurrection, no man will doubt but that the soul doth recompense something in the places below.* L.de anima c.58.

In the third Age S.*Cyprian*; *It is one thing, being cast into prison, not to go out thence till he pay the uttermost farthing, another, presently to receive the reward of faith, one thing being afflicted with long pains for sins to be wasted, and purged long with fire, another to have purged all sins by sufferings.* Epist.52. ad Antonin.

In the fourth Age S. *Ambrose*; *But whereas S. Paul says, yet so as by fire, he shews undoubtedly that he shall be saved, but yet shall suffer the punish-*

ment

ment of fire; that, being purged by fire, he may be saved, and not tormented for ever, as the infidels are with everlasting fire. in c. 3. Epist. 1. Cor.

In the same Age S. *Hieronm*; *This is that which he saith, thou shalt not go out of prison till thou shalt pay even thy little sins.* in c 5 Matth:

In the fifth Age S. *Augustin*; *Neither could it be truly said of some, That they are neither forgiven in this life, nor in the life to come, unless there were some, who though they are not forgiven in this life, yet should be in the life to come* l. 20. de civit. Dei c. 24 & l. 21. c. 13. And again, *With that transitory fire whereof the Apostle said,* He shall be saved, yet so as by fire, *not capital, but little sins are purged.* Serm. 41. de Sanctis. And in a third place, *He shall be safe, yet so as by fire: And because it is said,* He shall be safe, *that fire is contemned, yet that fire shall be more grievous then whatever a man can suffer in this life. Purge me, Lord, in this life, and make me such an one as shall not need that burning fire.* in Psal. 37.

The Council of *Sens* has defined, *That the fault by penance being taken away, there often remains the guilt of temporal punishment, &c. which is to be purged by fruits of worthy penance,* Decret. 12. An. Dom. 1431.

The Council of *Florence* has defined, *That such*

such as shall die truly penitent in the charity of God, before they have satisfied for their commissions and omissions by worthy fruits of penance, their soules are purged with purging paines. Sess. ult. An. Dom. 1431.

Objections solved.

Ob. *THe impiety of the impious man shall not hurt him, at what day soever he shall be converted from his impiety.*

Answ. It shall not hurt him, so as to exclude him from grace, and everlasting life, I grant; but may make him guilty of temporal punishment.

Ob. *If the tree fall to the North, or to the South, or in what place soever it shall fall, there it shall lie.*

Answ. *North* and *South* may signifie *Hell* and *Purgatory* (for ought you know) and then nothing against us, but if you will needs have it signifie *Hell* and *Heaven*, yet is not Purgatory excluded by that text; for it allowes of other places, *Or in what place soever it fall*, &c.

Ob. *Blessed are the dead who die in our Lord; from henceforth now saith the spirit, they rest from their labours, for their works follow them*, Apoc. 14.

Answ. This may be understood of Martyrs onely, who have no Purgatory. *Calvin* expounds,

pounds, *Who die in our Lord; for our Lords cauſe*; but it is rather ſpoken of the day of judgment, when it is ſaid *from henceforth*: and after that there ſhal be no *Purgatory*.

Ob. *When he ſhal give ſleep to his Beloved, behold the inheritance of our Lord*, Pſal. 126.

Anſw. That may be meant of the peculiarly Beloved, who need no Purgatory; but S. *Auguſtine* expounds it of the general Reſurrection, after which Purgatory ſhal ceaſe.

Ob. *Come O ye bleſſed*, &c. and *go ye accurſed*, &c. conclude all.

Anſw. As relating to the day of judgment, of which they are ſpoken, I grant it; as relating to the houre of death, I deny it; all do not preſently either poſſeſs heaven, or enter hell.

Ob. S. *Auguſtine* ſayes, *Beware brethren, let no man delude you, there are but two places.*

Anſw. There is not any third place of everlaſting reſt for infants, who die without Baptiſm, (as the Pelagians held) I grant: There is not any third place of temporal puniſhment, I deny; and ſo does S. *Auguſtine* in ſeveral places above cited.

ARTICLE XVII.

Of Prayer for the Dead.

OUr Tenet is, *That it is a holy and charitable customе, to offer prayers and oblations to God, for the soules of the faithfull departed*: which we prove thus.

The Argument.

1. If there be a place of temporall punishment, where some souls are purged, and venial sins remitted after this life, then that charity which binds us to pray that the living may be saved, will bind us also to pray that the dead may be freed from their punishments.
2. But there is a place of temporal punishment, where some souls are purged, and venial sins remitted after this life, as hath been proved in the precedent Article.
3. Therfore the same charity that binds us to pray the living may be saved, binds us also to pray the dead may be freed from their punishments.

The

The sequel of the *major* (which only needs proof) is evinced, because the souls of the faithful departed, not being now in a capacity to merit, nor consequently to help themselves, have greater need of our assistance then the living; therefore 'tis greater charity to relieve them.

A second Argument.

1. To deny obstinately what is reveal'd in holy Scripture is no less then heresie.
2. But it is revealed in holy Scripture, that the prayers and oblations of the Church are available for the soules of the faithful departed,
3. Therefore to deny this obstinately can be no less then heresie.

The first proposition is granted by all.

The second is proved: *Judas Machabeus sent twelve thousand drachma's of silver to Hierusalem for sacrifice to be offered for sins* (*viz.* for those that were slain) *well and religiously thinking of the resurrection*, &c. *It is therefore a holy and a healthful cogitation to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins*, 2. Machab. c. 12. v. 43, 44, 45. King *David* mourned, wept, and fasted after the death of *Saul* and *Ionathas*, 2 *King.* 1. The men of *Iabes Galead* fasted and mourned for it seven dayes together without

reproof, 2 Kings 14.21. *What ſhall they do who are baptized for the dead* (by weeping, faſting, giving almes, and praying for them) *if the dead riſe not at all? Why then are they baptized for the dead?* 1 Cor. 15.29. In this ſenſe the Fathers expound the word *baptiſm*, or *baptize*, S. *Cyprian de cœna Dom. Nazianzen orat. de Epiphania.* And Chriſt himſelf ſaying, *I am to be baptized with a baptiſm*, meaning his paſſion, and ſufferings for our ſins.

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond Age S. *Clement* tells us, S. *Peter taught them, among other works of mercy, to burie the dead, and diligently performe their funerall Rites, and alſo to pray and give almes for them*; Epiſt. 1. de S. Petro.

In the ſecond Age *Tertullian, We make yearly oblations for the dead*, de corona militis.

In the third Age *Origen*, *Though a releaſement out of priſon be promiſed*, (S. Matth. 5.) *yet it is ſignified, that none can get out from thence but he who payes the utmoſt farthing*, in Epiſt. ad Roman. & Hom. 35. in S. Luc.

In the fourth Age S. *Cyril* of *Hieruſalem*, *We beſeech God for all thoſe who have died before us, believing the obſecration of that holy and dreadful ſacrifice which is put on the altar, to be the greateſt help of the ſouls for which it is offered*, Catech. myſtagog. 5.

In

In the ſame Age S. *Hierom*, *Theſe things were not in vain ordained by the Apoſtles, that in the venerable and dreadful myſteries* (the Maſs) *there ſhould be made a memory of thoſe who have departed this life: they knew much benefit would hence accrue to them*, Homil. 3. in Epiſt. ad Philip.

In the fifth Age S. *Auguſtine*; *Neither is it to be denied, that the ſoules of the dead are eaſed by the piety of their living friends, when the ſacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them*, in Enchirid. c. 110. & l. de cura pro mortuis, c. 1.

Again, *We read in the Books of the Machabees of ſacrifice offered for the dead, but though it were no where read in the old Teſtament, yet not ſmal is the authority of the univerſal Church, which ſhines in this cuſtome, where the commendation of the dead hath its place in the prayers of the Prieſt, which are powred out to our Lord God at his altar*, l. de cura pro pro mort. c. 1.

The firſt Nicene Council decreed thus, *When a Biſhop dies, let notice be given of his death to all Churches and Monaſteries in the Pariſh, that prayers be made for him*, c. 65. Arab. anno Dom. 325.

The ſecond *Cabilon* Council decreed; *It further ſeemeth good to us, that in all the ſolemnities of Maſſes our Lord be prayed to in*

due place for the soules of the dead, &c. therefore the holy Church keeps antiently this customs, &c. c. 79.

The Council of *Florence* defined, *That the suffrages, Masses, prayers, and alms of the living profit the soules of the faithful departed, that they may be eased of their paines.* Sess. ult. An. Dom. 1439.

Objections solved.

Ob. *There is a sin to death, for that I say not that any man ask*, 1. S. *Iohn* 5, 16. Therefore we must not pray for the sins of the dead.

Answ. By a *sin to death*, the Apostle signifies final impenitence, or a mortal sin persever'd in till death, and for such a sin we are not taught to pray; so that I distinguish your consequence. Therfore we must not pray for the sins of the dead who die impenitent, I grant; who die penitent and confess'd, I deny; and so doth *S. Iohn* in the words immediately preceding; *He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin not to death, let him ask, and life shal be given him, sinning not to death.*

Ob. *Whatsoever thy hand is able to do, work it instantly; for neither work, nor reason, nor wisdome, nor knowledge shall be in hell*, Eccles. 9. 10.

Answ. S. *Hierome* tells you *that place is either*

either understood of the impious, who believe there is no hell at all, or of such as go immediately to the hell of the damned, for whom there is no comfort or relief in the prayers and offerings of the Church; (which we grant) *Comment. in hunc locum.*

Ob. *We must every one receive the proper things of the body, according as he hath done either good or evill*, 2 Cor. 5. 10. Therefore the prayers of the living cannot profit the soules of the dead.

Answ. Your consequence is false; for as S. *Augustine* sayes, *The soules in Purgatory receive more or less benefit by the prayers and sacrifices of the Church, as every soul is worthy either ease or misery, according as she hath wrought living in the flesh.* L. de cura pro mort. c. 1.

Ob. Soules cannot merit in Purgatory: Therefore they cannot satisfie in Purgatory. Therefore vain are their sufferings there, and vain our prayers for them.

Answ. Your first proposition is true, but your consequences are both vain and false. A man cannot merit without liberty, but he may satisfie, though compel'd to it by the Judg; and so do soules in *Purgatory*: Therefore our prayers are available for them, to free them from that compulsorie punishment.

Ob. The very thief that was saved from the crosa was in heaven with Christ the very same day: *This day thou shalt be with me in paradise,*

S. *Luke* 23. 43. therfore doubtleſs there is no third place, nor prayer for the dead.

Anſw. By *Paradiſe* in that place is ſignified *Limbus Patrum*, or the priſon of the antient Fathers, which was then made a Paradiſe, or place of bleſſedneſs, by reaſon of the preſence of Chriſts humane Soule, and Divinity in it. For Chriſt, being dead, immediately deſcended thither, according to that, *He deſcended into hell.*

Ob. I do not believe a *Limbus Patrum*, or that the Fathers were kept in priſon till the coming, and death of Chriſt.

Anſw. No, nor the Scriptures, nor the Apoſtles Creed, farther then it pleaſes your phanſie: The Scriptures teach: *Thou* (Chriſt) *in the bloud of thy teſtament haſt let forth thy priſoners out of the lake in which there is no water*, Zach. 9. 11. *The Fathers of the old Teſtament died according to faith, not having received the promiſes*, Heb. 11. 13. *God hath provided for us ſome better thing, that they without us ſhould not be conſummate*, Heb. 13. 40. *That Chriſt roſe from the dead, the firſt fruits of them that ſleep*, 1 Cor. 15. 20. *The firſt begotten of the dead*, Coloſ. 1. 18. *That the way of the Holies* (heaven, Heb. 9. 24.) *was not yet manifeſted, the former tabernacle* (the old Teſtament) *yet ſtanding*, Heb. 9. 8. *That the Son of man was in the heart of the earth three dayes and three nights*, S. Matth. 12. 40. *That God did*

not

not leave his ſoul in hel, Acts 2.27. *That, aſcending on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men, having firſt deſcended into the lower parts of the earth*, Epheſ. 4.8. *That he holdeth the primacy in all things, being the beginning and firſt born of the dead*, Coloſ. 1.18. *That being ſlain he came in ſpirit and preached to them that were in priſon, who had been incredulous in the dayes of* Noah, *when the Ark was building*, 1 Pet. 3.19. Yet all this you will not believe, who can help it? All true believers do, and know your conſequence to be falſe.

The fourth *Toletan* Council defines, *That Chriſt deſcended into hell, that he might take out from thence the Saints that were kept, and overcome the power of death*, &c. *This is the faith of the Catholike Church*, &c. c. 1. an. Dom. 681.

ARTICLE

Article XVIII.

Of Indulgences.

NOte, for your better understanding this question;

First, That *Indulgences*, or Pardons (as some call them) concern not at all the remission of sins either mortal or venial, but suppose all mortal sins remitted by contrition and the Sacraments (otherwise they profit us nothing) and respect only the remission of canonical penances, and such temporal punishments as are, and may be injoyned us by the Church.

Secondly, They no way exempt or free us from natural infirmities, or from the punishments of outward Courts, or in the inward Court of God, but only in the Court of Penance.

THis presupposed, our Tenet is, *That the Church hath a judiciary power from God (our sins being first remitted by the Sacraments) to release all canonical penances, with all other temporal punishments which*

are

are or may be injoyned us by the Church in the Court of Penance, whileſt we are under her iuriſdiction. Proved thus.

The firſt Argument.

1. That power which can bind, can looſe.
2. But the Church ha's a power from God to bind and oblige us in the Court of Penance to ſome temporal puniſhments, after the ſins themſelves are forgiven.
3. Therefore the Church ha's a power in the Court of Penance to releaſe and looſe us from the ſaid temporal puniſhments.

The *major* is evident by induction, in all judiciary and obliging powers, or Tribunals, whether ſpiritual or temporal.

The *minor* is proved, by that Commiſſion firſt promiſed S. *Peter: To thee will I give the keyes of the kingdome of heaven, whatever thou ſhalt bind on earth ſhall be bound alſo in heaven, and whatever thou ſhalt looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven*, S. *Matth.* 16, 19. and afterwards to all the reſt of the Apoſtles, S. *Matth.* 18. 18.

It was by vertue of this commiſſion, that S. *Paul* injoyned the inceſtuous Corinthian Penance, and after remitted part of it after the ſin it ſelf had been remitted by ſorrow and contrition, 1 *Cor.* 5. 3. *To whom ye forgive any thing*

thing (ſaith he to the Prieſts of Corinth) *I forgive alſo: for if I forgave any thing to whom I forgave it, for your ſake forgave I it, in the perſon of Chriſt*, 2 Cor. 2. 10. *Sufficient to ſuch a man* (being now contrite) *is this puniſhment* (or Penance) 2 *Cor.* 2. 6.

Ob. But you will ſay perhaps, if this be all that is of faith concerning *Indulgences*, we are but in a ſad condition, as having no effectuall meanes whereby to remit the temporal puniſhments remaining due to our ſins after the ſins themſelves are forgiven.

Anſw. You miſtake in this; for the reaſon why ſometimes there remaine temporall puniſhments due to our ſins, after the ſins themſelves are pardoned, is, becauſe in the Sacraments we apply not the ſuperabundant merits and ſatisfactions of Chriſt ſo perfectly and fully to our Soules as we might, and ought, if we our ſelves were not in fault, through want of worthy preparation, and perfect contrition, when we come to them: otherwiſe they are of force, and would remit, not only all our ſins, but all the puniſhment due to them; proved thus.

The ſecond Argument.

1. What ever may hinder our entring into Heaven and obtaining everlaſting life, whileſt

whileſt we are under the Churches juriſdiction, the Church hath power by virtue of the Sacraments (if there be no impediment on our part for want of perfect preparation) to releaſe us of.

2. But temporal puniſhments remaining due to ſin after the ſin it ſelfe is forgiven will for a time hinder our entring in Heaven and obtaining everlaſting life.

3. Therefore the Church by vertue of the Sacraments, (if there be no impediment on our part) hath power to remit ſuch temporall puniſhments.

The *major* is proved by that commiſſion given to S. *Peter* and the reſt, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on earth, it ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven*, S. *Matth.* 16. 19. and 18. 18. It extends to whatever may hinder our entring into heaven.

The *minor* is proved; Becauſe *we ſhall not be delivered out of priſon* (Purgatory) *till we repay the laſt farthing* (the leaſt debt of temporal puniſhment) S. *Matth.* 5. 26, 27. Now that the ſuperabundant merits and ſatisfactions of Chriſt (if fully and perfectly applied to our ſoules by the Sacraments) are of force, and do remit all guilt, as wel of ſin as puniſhment, is of undoubted faith with Catholiques; becauſe any one drop of his bloud (much more the whole, ſhed for us on the croſs) by reaſon of

its

its hypostatical union with the Deity, is of infinite value, and a sufficient price for the whole world. If therefore through our own default we injoy not this means of making satisfaction for temporal punishments, we must betake our selves to fruits of worthy penance.

Fathers for this point.

IN the second Age *Tertullian* mentions *pains and penances remitted to such as were penitent, at the request of Martyrs: Which peace* (saith he) *some not having in the Church, were wont to beg it of the Martyrs who were in prison*, L. ad Martyres, c. 1.

In the third Age S. *Cyprian*; *A penitent working, and asking, he* (the Pope) *may clemently pardon whatsoever both Martyrs have asked, and Priests have done for such men. Serm. de lapsis.* And again, *That Martyrs had beg'd such peace for them who were fallen*, Epist. 15. (By *peace* is meant reconciliation, or admission to the Sacraments.)

In the fourth Age S. *Chrysostome*; *It hath been committed to those that inhabit the earth, to dispense those things which are in heaven*, &c. *The Father hath given all power to the Son, and I see the very same power to have been delivered to them by the Son*, l. 2. de Sacerdot.

In the fifth Age the fourth Council of *Carthage*

thoge decreed, *That a Priest should injoyne the laws of penance to one imploring penance, without exception of the person*, c. 74.

The first Nicene Council decreed, *That such as had deny'd the faith should do many years penance, yet it should be in the power of the Bishops (if they saw them do penance, and bewaile their error from the heart) to deal more courteously with them, and receive them to communion*, Can. 11. An. 325.

The Ancyran Council decreed, *That Bishops ought to have power, considering the conversation of all, to shorten or prolong the time of their penance*, c. 5. an. Dom. 308.

The Council of *Sens* decreed, *That the fault being taken away, there often remains the guilt of temporal punishment*, &c. *which is to be purged by fruits of worthy penance*, Decret. 12.

The Council of *Constance* condemned *John Wickliff's* error concerning *Indulgences*, Sess. 8. See also the Council of *Florence*, *Decreto Vnionis*, where this doctrine is defined.

Objections solved.

Ob. THe merits and satisfactions of Christ (as you confess) are infinite: Therfore those, being applied to us by the Sacrament of penance, remit not only all our sins, but all punishments due to them.

Answ

Answ. All the eternal punishments, I grant; all the temporal, I deny, speaking universally, and of all; though somtimes they do, in case of very perfect contrition, and application of them. The reason of this is, because though they be infinite of themselves, yet the application of them to us is finite, and according to the measure of our contrition, and disposition, which is seldome so perfect as it might, and ought, or as the whole gravity of our sins requires; hence it was, that Christ gave his Church power to injoyn us penances, and to release them also, if we were heartily contrite, and gave sufficient signes of our amendment.

Ob. If there were any such thing as *Indulgences*, they would be rather hurtful then good, seeing they release men from good works, and penances injoyn'd for sin.

Answ. They are very good, and much conducing to true piety, because though they free men from some outward penal works, they alwayes presuppose, and most effectually invite men to inward acts of charity and contrition, as also to works of mercy, which are of a more excellent and high nature. Indulgences are never given but to such as are first confess'd, and contrite for their sins.

Ob. Christ hath fully satisfied for all our sins, and all the punishments due thereto.

Answ. True, but that excludes not the application

plication of his ſatisfactions to our ſoules.

Ob. You hold, that you can free ſoules out of Purgatory at pleaſure by the Popes Indulgences.

Anſw. The Church holds no ſuch Doctrine.

Ob. I forgave thee all the debt, becauſe thou beſoughteſt me, oughteſt not thou therfore alſo to have mercy on thy fellow-ſervant, even as I had mercy on thee? S. Matth. 18. 32.

Anſw. In ſome caſe, as of Martyrdome and very perfect contrition, we grant, all the debt, not only of ſin and eternal, but of temporal puniſhment, is forgiven; but not alwayes.

That text of S. *Matthew* is a parable, and concernes onely the debt of ſin, as is manifeſt by thoſe words of our Saviour following: *So alſo ſhall my heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not every one his brother from your hearts*, verſ. 34. Nor has every one power to give Indulgences, but onely Biſhops and Eccleſiaſtical perſons; therfore this place is nothing againſt us.

Ob. You buy and ſel *Indulgences.*

Anſw. No, thoſe abuſes are long ſince reformed, and were never allowed by the Church.

Ob. The inceſtuous Corinthian was impenitent, and his ſin not forgiven, when S. *Paul* injoyned him penance, 1 *Cor.* 5.

Answ. True; but he was penitent, and his sin remitted, when he remitted part of the said penance; a certain argument, that the guilt of punishment may remain, after that of sin is taken away.

Ob. *David* sayes, *A brother cannot redeem a brother*, Psal. 48. 8.

Answ. From sin, eternal punishment, or temporal death, I grant; (and this is all that *David* means) from temporal punishment remaining due to sin, after it is forgiven, I deny; if he be able to apply the merits of Christ to our souls, as the Church does by Indulgences.

Quere. Are Indulgences available for souls in Purgatory by way of suffrage, though not by way of jurisdiction?

Answ. Some hold it probable; but nothing is defined in this matter; let it suffice us, they are available and beneficial to the living.

Article

ARTICLE XIX.

Of ſin, both Mortall, and Veniall.

OUr Tenet is, *That ſome ſins are mortal of their own nature, and rob the ſoul of juſtice, and ſpiritual life: Others but venial, and deprive not the ſoul of juſtice, but only weaken it, and charity in us.*

The firſt Argument.

1. All thoſe ſins which rob the ſoul of juſtice, and ſpiritual life, are mortal ſins.
2. But all thoſe ſins which are directly contrary to the commandements of the decalogue, rob the ſoul of juſtice and ſpiritual life.
3. Therefore all thoſe ſins which are directly contrary to the commandements of the decalogue, are mortal ſins.

The *major* is manifeſt, becauſe by *mortal ſin* we underſtand nothing elſe, but ſin cauſing in

the ſoul a privation of juſtice, by which the ſoul lives to God, and without which ſhe is dead as to him.

The *minor* is proved: becauſe without repentance God damnes whoever breaks the Commandements of the Decalogue. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandements*, S. Matth. 19. 17. *He that ſhall break one of theſe leaſt commandements, and teach men ſo to do, he ſhall be called leaſt in the kingdome of heaven*, S. *Matth.* 5. 20. and in the 20. chapter of *Exodus*, and many other places, he threatens grievous puniſhments to ſuch as break them.

Now 'tis moſt certain, it is inconſiſtent with Gods juſtice, to damne a juſt man, ſo long as he remains ſo. Therfore theſe ſins rob the ſoul of juſtice and ſpiritual life, and ſo do likewiſe all deliberate ſins, either of thought, word, or deed, in things of any notable conſequence, and cauſing any notable offence towards God, our neighbour, or our ſelves. *The ſtipend of ſin* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *is death*, Rom 6. 23. And again, *Know ye not that the unjuſt ſhall not poſſeſs the kingdom of God? Do not erre: neither fornicators, nor ſervers of idols, nor adulterers*, &c. *nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners ſhall poſſeſs the kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10.

A

A second Argument.

1. All those sins, which rob not the soul of justice, and make her not guilty of damnation, are not mortal, but venial sins.
2. But there be many kinds of sins, which rob not the soul of justice, and make her not guilty of damnation:
3. Therefore there be many kinds of sin, which are not mortall, but onely veniall.

The *major* is manifest, because a venial sin is defined, *to be a small sin, which deserves not death, but is easie to be pardoned.*

The *minor* is proved. *Whosoever shall be angry with his brother, shall be in danger of judgment, Whosoever shall say to his brother, racha, shall be in danger of councel, and whosoever shall say thou foole, shall be guilty of hell fire,* S. *Matth.* c. 5. v. 23. Here Christ himself distinguishes three sorts of sin, of which the least onely renders a man guilty of damnation. *Blind guides* (saith he) *that strain at a Gnat, and swallow a Camel,* S. *Matth.* 23. 24. Here he teacheth, that some sins, in comparison of others, have the proportion of a *Gnat* to a *Camel*; now sure no mortal sin can fitly be compared to a *Gnat*; those are all *Camels* at the least.

And in another place: *Hypocrite, cast out the beam* (the mortal sin) *out of thine own eye, and then thou shalt clearly see to take forth the mote* (the venial sin) *out of thy brothers eye,* S. *Luk.* 6.42. Do Sectaries think mortal sins but motes? *Thou shalt not go out from thence* (Purgatory) *till thou repay the last farthing,* S. *Matth.* 5.27. That, is for the least venial sin.

And S. *Paul* tells us, *That some build on the foundation of Christ, wood, hay, stubble,* &c. *for which they shal suffer detriment, but themselves shal be saved, yet so as by fire,* 1 *Cor.* 3 13, 14, 15. Therefore those are not mortal, but venial sins *Concupiscence, when it has conceived, brings forth sin* (there is venial sin) *but sin when it is consummate, ingendreth death,* S. *James* 1. 14, 15. (There is mortal sin.) Though all delight, even with imperfect deliberation in the motions of concupiscence and thought of sin be venial sin, yet by Gods mercy it is not mortal sin, til it be consummate, either by deliberate delight, voluntary consent, or outward act.

A third Argument.

1. All mortal sins are directly contrary to the law of God, and sufficient to break charity betwixt him and man.
2. But there be many sins, which are not directly contrary to the law of God, or sufficient

cient to break charity betwixt him and man.

3. Therefore there be many ſins which are not mortal.

The firſt Prop. hath been already proved.

The ſecond is proved; in regard an idle word, a jeſting, or officious untruth which hurts no man; a very ſmall exceſſe in meat or drink, more then is neceſſary for natures ſuſtenance; a little overplus of joy, grief, or ſuddaine paſſion, a little diſtraction in time of prayer, the theft of a pin, or apple, are not directly contrary to charity, nor ſufficient to break it betwixt man and man, much leſſe betwixt God and man. For as his goodneſſe, ſo is his charity, far greater then ours, yet all theſe we acknowledg to be ſins, though not mortal. Nay *We muſt render an account for every idle word, S. Math.* 12.37. Yet every idle word is not a damning ſin, otherwiſe it were better to want a tongue, then have it, and we were all in a moſt deſparat condition, ſince idle and ſuperfluous words, (morally ſpeaking) cannot be avoided; yet are we bound under damnation, not to ſin mortally.

Add hereunto, *That the juſt man falls ſeven times and riſeth up again, Prov.* 24.16. (not mortally, for then he were no longer juſt.) *We all offend in many things, S. James* 3.2. (not mortally by Gods grace, for ſome have been *juſt*

even before God, and walked in all his commandements, S. Luke 1.5.) And S. *John* ſpeaking of himſelf and others who were *cleanſed in the bloud of Chriſt* (from all mortal ſin) adds notwithſtanding; *Yet if we ſhall ſay that we have no ſin* (to wit venial) *we ſeduce our ſelves, and the truth is not in us*, 1 Epiſt. of S. *John* 1.8.

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond Age *Tertullian* termeth *venial ſins little, ſmal, and daily ſins*, l. de anima c. 17.

In the third Age *Origen*; *By wood, hay, and ſtubble, which* Paul *ſpeaks of* (1 Cor. 3.) *is manifeſtly diſcovered, there be ſome ſins ſo light, that they are compared to ſtubble, to which, as ſoon as fire is brought, it cannot long continue.* Hom. 14. in Levit. & 15. in Num.

In the fourth Age S. *Hierome* on thoſe words, *Till thou repay the laſt farthing. This is that which he ſaith, thou ſhalt not go out of priſon, till thou ſhalt pay the leaſt ſins, in* c. 5. S. *Matth.* and S. *Cyprian* gives the ſame interpretation of them, *L.* 4. *Epiſt.* 2. And againe S. *Hierome*, (on thoſe words, *Why doſt thou ſee a mote in thy brothers eye?*) *He ſpeaks of thoſe who being guilty themſelves of mortal crimes, permit not leſſer ſins in their brethren, ſtraining the Gnat, and ſwallowing the Camel*, in c. 7. S. *Matth.* Laſtly, he *condemnes* Jovinian *as an Heretike for holding all*

ſins

ſins to be equal, (an old paradox of the Stoicks) l. 2. cont. Jovin. c. 15, 16, 17.

In the fifth Age S. *Auguſtine*; *Sometimes we lie for the good of others, a ſin therfore it is, but venial*, l. Enchirid. c. 22. And again, *For daily, ſhort, and light ſins (without which this life cannot paſs) the daily prayer of the faithful ſatisfies. Enchirid. c.* 72. And in another place; *There be certain venial ſins, without which the juſt man cannot live*, L. de ſpiritu & litera c. 28.

The Council of *Sens* decreed it *Hereſie, to hold, that venial ſins are not diſtinct from mortal*, In Annot. poſt decreta fidei.

Obiections ſolved.

Ob. *THe ſoul that ſinneth the ſame ſhall die*, *Ezech.* 18. 20. Therefore all ſins be mortal.

Anſw. I deny the conſequence; the Prophet ſpeaks there of enormous ſins, and had exemplified before, in theft, murder, idolatry, &c. which are all mortal.

Ob. He that offends in one, is made guilty of all, S. James 2. 10.

Anſw. In one mortal ſin, I grant, for any one mortal ſin is directly againſt charity, and makes us guilty of the whole law of charity. In one venial ſin, I deny. S. *James* exemplifies in murder & adultery, *v.* 11. which are not venial ſins.

Ob. *There is no condemnation for them which are in Chriſt Jeſus.* *Anſw.*

Answ. True; for whilst we are in him, we are in charity, and state of grace.

Ob. *He that doth sin, is of the Devill.* 1 *Joh.* 3. 8.

Answ. S. *John* speakes there of mortal sin, such as deprives us of the justice and grace of God; as is manifest by that which goes before and after.

Ob. *To the elect all things cooperate unto good.* Therfore all sins are venial to them.

Answ. I deny the consequence; for though their very sins and failings are an occasion of contrition, and good to them, yet every breach of the commandements, till they expiate and blot it out by true contrition, confession, and satisfaction, is as mortal to them, as to the reprobate.

Ob. *Whom God hath predestinated, them also hath he called, and whom he hath called, them also hath he justified.* Therefore no sin shall be imputed to them.

Answ. I deny the consequence, for this only proves the predestinate shall have final perseverance and die in state of grace, which hinders not, but some time or other in their lives, they may incur the guilt of mortal sin, as *David*, *Peter*, *Magdalen*, and others did; *Davids* adultery, *Peters* denial of his master, and *Magdalens* incontinence were no venial sins, yet these were all predestinate Saints.

Ob.

Ob These sins were pardon'd them, and therefore venial.

Answ. I deny the consequence speaking properly of venial sin; For so there is no sin of the reprobate, if they had confessed it, and been heartily sorry for it (as these were) which would not have been pardoned them, *Ezech.* 18. 21. though many of their sins were mortal of their own nature, and never pardoned, by reason of their final impenitence.

Ob. God may damne a man for vnial sin, if he so please.

Answ. Speaking of him, as absolute creator and Lord of all things, I grant it, as a just Judg, who renders to every man according to his works, I deny; for so he cannot inflict the same punishment for every idle word, or humane imperfection, as for murther, or Adultery.

Ob. Every venial sin is against an infinite Majesty.

Answ. In some degree I grant, in a degree deserving death, I deny; the measure of the punishment must not exceed that of the offence.

Article

ARTICLE XX.

Of the worſhip and invocation of Angels and Saints.

NOte for your better apprehending this controverſie, that there are as many different degrees of inward & outward religious wroſhip, as of civil, which are diverſified, according to the various dignity of the perſons to whom they are given (worſhip or honour being nothing elſe but a teſtimony of excellency) nor can they alwaies be diſtinguiſh'd by the outward act; which often times is one and the ſame to God and men, to Kings and ſubjects; (as in the act of kneeling, bowing, putting off the hat, &c.) but commonly by the inward affection, and intention with which we do them.

When we kneel, and pray to Angels or Saints, we do it only as to Gods eminent creatures and for Gods ſake; when we kneel or pray to God, we do it as to our Lord, God, Creator, Redeemer, and laſt end, and for his own ſake purely we pray to Angels and Saints to aſſiſt us, by and through the merits of Chriſt;

Christ; without which we know they are and can do nothing. We pray to Christ to help us by and through his own merits only so that there is no more danger of robbing God of his honour, by worshiping his Angels and Saints, then of robbing a King of his honour, by reverencing his Peeres and Nobles, according to their several dignities and capacities: this presuppos'd,

OUr Tenet is, *That the blessed Angels and Saints in heaven can and do know our actions and affairs (at least as far as appertains to their state) and that it is good and profitable to worship them, as Gods eminent creatures, with an inferior worship proportioned to their excellency, as also to invocate and pray to them, as to subordinate mediators of intercession to God for us*; which we prove thus.

The first Argument.

1. What was possible to the Prophets in this life by the special light of grace only, cannot be impossible to the Saints and Angels in heaven.

2. But

2. But the Prophets in this life by the ſpecial light of grace only could and did know things done at a great diſtance.

3. Therfore the Saints and Angels in heaven can and do know things done at a great diſtance.

The *major* is manifeſt, becauſe from the greater to the leſs in the ſame kind, the Saints and Angels have a greater and more ſpecial light of grace, then the Prophets could have in this life.

The *minor* is proved; becauſe *Eliſeus* (by the ſpecial light of grace only) ſaw what was done in the King of *Syria's* privie chamber, 4 *Kings* 6. and what paſſed betwixt his ſervant *Geezi* and *Naaman*, when he was abſent, 4 *Kings* 5. S. *Peter* knew the ſacrilegious act of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, though acted privately betwixt themſelves. Add unto this their often foretelling deſtruction and calamity to whole cities and Kingdoms, which came to paſs accordingly.

A ſecond Argument.

1. All that which the very Devils know, by the meer light of nature, the bleſſed Angels in heaven (who have the light of grace and glory ſuperadded) cannot be denied to know.

2. But

2. But the very Devils (by the meer light of nature) know our actions.
3. Therefore the bleſſed Angels in heaven cannot be denied to know them.

The *major* is alſo manifeſt, becauſe from the greater to the leſs in the ſame kind.

The *minor* is proved, as wel by the conceſſion of our Adverſaries, as by the Scripture, in which we read, *For the accuſer of our Brethren* (the Devil) *is caſt forth, who accuſed them before our God day and night*, Apoc. 12. 10. He could not accuſe them, unleſs he knew their actions.

A third Argument.

1. They who ſee God perfectly with all his attributes and perfections, muſt needs ſee us with all our actions.
2. But the bleſſed Angels and Saints in heaven ſee God perfectly with all his attributes and perfections.
3. Therfore the bleſſed Angels and Saints in heaven muſt needs ſee us and all our actions.

The neceſſary ſequel of the *maior* is manifeſt, becauſe God is infinitely more inviſible and inſcrutable, then we and all his other creatures put together; and contains both us and all things in himſelf in a moſt eminent manner. *In him* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *we live, be moved, and are.*

The

The *minor* is proved, in regard the blessed Angels and Saints in heaven see and know God face to face, even as they themselves are known, 1 *Cor.* 13. 10, 11, 12.

A fourth Argument.

1. If the blessed Angels and Saints be our Guardians and Governours by Gods appointment, know our affairs, and pray for us, then must it needs be very good and profitable for us to worship, invocate, and pray to them.
2. But they be our Guardians and Governors by Gods appointment, know our affaires, and pray for us.
3. Therefore it is very good and profitable for us to worship, invocate, and pray to them.

The *maior* is evident, because honor with an humble address by way of invocating their assistance, is due from all Pupills to their Guardians by the light of nature.

The *minor* (that they are our Guardians and Governours) is proved; *See that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say to you that their Angels in heaven* (theirs by special patronage) *always see the face of my Father which is in heaven*, S. Matth. 18. 10. *The Angels are all ministring spirits sent to minister for them who shall receive*

receive the inheritance of salvation, Heb. 1. 14.

That God hath appointed the Saints to govern us, is proved thus. *He that shall overcome and keep my works to the end, to him will I give power over nations, and he shall rule them in an iron rod*, Apoc. 2. 26 27. *Thou hast made us* (the Saints) *to our God a kingdom, and Priests, and we shall reigne upon the earth*, Apoc 5. 10.

That they know our necessities, and affairs, is proved thus: *There shall be joy before the Angels of God upon one sinner doing penance*, S. Luke 15. 10. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say to you their Angels that are in heaven alwayes see the face of my Father*. &c. S. *Matth.* 18. 10. which of necessity implies, that the Angels know when we are injur'd, and pray to God in our behalf; and the Saints *are as the Angels of God in heaven*, S. Matth. 22. 31. *Equall to the Angels*, S. Luke 20. 36. *Now therfore when thou didst pray and* Sara *thy daughter in law* (saith the Angel to old *Toby*) *I did present thy prayers to our Lord*, Tob. 12. 12.

That the Angels and Saints actually pray for us, is proved; *The Angel of our Lord answered and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Hierusalem, and the cities of Juda, with which thou hast been angry these threescore and ten years?* Zach. 1. 12. *The foure and twenty Elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and vialls ful of*

odors, which are the prayers of the Saints, Apoc. 5.8. and *Judas Machabeus saw in a vision Onias that had been High Priest, holding up his hands and praying for the Jewes, and pointing also to another in these words; This is a lover of the Brethren, who prayeth much for the people, and for the holy City*, (to wit) *Jeremie the Prophet of God*, 2 Machab. c. last. 12,13,14. Those had both been dead many years before.

That it is also good and profitable for us to worship and invocate the Saints and Angels, is proved thus; because the chosen friends of God are recorded in holy Scripture to have often done it.

I am the Prince of the host of our Lord (said the Angel to *Josue*) *and Josue fel flat on the ground and adored*, Josue 5.14. *Lot* (when he had *seen the Angels*) *rose up and went to meet them, and adored with his face bowed toward the earth*, Gen. 19.1. S *John fel down to adore before the feet of the Angel* (though he had once been willed not to do it) *Apoc.* 22.8. Therfore he thought and knew it lawful to be done, or els committed wilful idolatry, which we presume in common modesty none wil affirm.

The Angel that delivered me from all evil (saith the Patriarch *Jacob*) *bless these children*, Gen. 48.16. *Jacob prevailed against the Angel, and wept and prayed to him*, Ose 12.4. *Be my name* (saith *Jacob*) *the names also of my fathers, Abra-*

Abraham and Isaac invocated in them, Gen. 48. 17. *Grace to you* (saith S. *John*) *and peace from him that is, that was, and that shall come, and from the seven spirits that are in the sight of the throne*, Apoc. 1. 4. *seven Angels*, according to the 12. of *Toby*. To conclude, *Call therefore* (saith *Eliphas* to *Job*) *and turn thee to some of the Saints*, *Job* 5. 1. a very vain and senseless exprobration, had it not been a custome with *Job* to invocate the Saints.

Besides, the faithful on earth, being Members of the same mystical Body of Christ with the blessed Angels and Saints in heaven, it cannot stand with common sense and reason, but they must have some care and knowledge of our condition; because *if one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it, and if one member glory, all the members rejoyce with it*, 1 Cor. 12. 25.

Fathers for this point.

IN the second Age *Dionysius. I constantly affirm, with the divine Scripture, that the prayers of the Saints are very profitable for us in this life after this manner; When a man is inflamed with a desire to imitate the Saints, and distrusting his own weakness, betakes himself to any Saint, beseeching him to be his helper, and petitioner to God for him; he shall obtain by that means very great assistance.*

Eccles. Hierar. c. 7. par. 3. Sect. 3. prope finem.

In the same Age S. *Clement.* *We command you that the Martyrs be in all honor among you, even as* James *the Bishop, and* Stephen *our fellow Deacon hath been amongst us; for God hath made them blessed, and holy men have honored them.* L. Apost. constitut. 5.

In the same Age *Justin Martyr. We worship and adore both God the Father and the Son, Who came and taught us these things &c. and also the company of his followers and the good Angels, and we worship them both by words and deeds, and in truth, even as we our selves have been taught and instructed.* In Apolog. 2. and Antoninum Pium.

In the third Age *Origen: I will begin to fall down on my knees, and pray to all the Saints to succour me, who dare not ask God for the exceeding greatness of my sin. O Saints of God! with teares and weeping I beseech you to fall down before his mercy for me a wretch.* In Lamentat.

And again: *All the Saints departed bearing yet charity towards the living, it shall not be inconvenient to say, that they have a care of their salvation, and help them with their prayers to God for them: for it is written in the Machabees, This is Ieremy, who alwayes prayes for the people, &c.* Homil. 3. in Cantica.

In

In the fourth age S. *Chrysostome*: *They adored the same Saints that we do at this day.* Hom. de Sanctis Juven. & Maxim.

In the same age S. *Ambrose*; *He honours Christ that honours his Martyrs* Sermon. 6. And again: *We must pray to the Angels who are given us to be our defenders, we must pray to the Martyrs, &c. for they are able to pray for our sins, who have washed away their own, &c. These are the Martyrs of God, our Governors, and watchful beholders of our life and actions*, l. de viduis.

In the same age S. *Chrysostome*: *If Moses and Samuel shall stand before me*, (Jerem. 15.) *observe* (saith he) *how it is said of the two Prophets, if they shall stand before me, &c. because they both had prayed for them, and had not obtained, &c. yet let not us contemne the prayers of the Saints, &c. but let us intreat them to pray for us, that we may obtain the promises*, Homil. 1. in Epist. ad Thessalon. And again, *The servants of Christ even when they are dead, are the protectors of the kings of this world*, Hom. 26. in 2. ad Cor.

In the fifth age S. *Augustine*: *The multitude of the Gentiles doth now adore with bended knees most blessed Peter the Fisher-man*: Sermon. de Sanctis Pet & Paul. And again, *We do not worship them as Gods, but as holy men*, in Psalm. 96. And in another place, *All the Martyrs*

that are with Christ intercede for us, nor cease they to pray for us, unless we cease to sigh after them, in Psal. 85. And finally in the 40. chapter of his Meditations he prayes thus: *O blessed Trinity! preserve me from all evill* &c. *by the prayers of the Patriarchs, by the intercession of the Apostles, by the constancy of the Martyrs* &c. *and by the intercession of all the Saints,* &c. Then having invocated the B. Virgin, and many Angels and Saints by name, he concludes saying, *I beseech you intercede for me a sinner, unto God, that I may be delivered from the jawes of the Devil and everlasting death.*

The Council of *Gangers* defined, *That if any man out of pride abominate the assemblies which are celebrated at the confessions of the Martyrs, or execrate the mysteries which are there done together with their memories, be he Anathema,* Can. 20. an. Dom. 324.

The sixth Constantinopolitan Council defined, *That a Christian, adoring only God his Creator, may invocate the Saints, that they would vouchsafe to pray for him to the divine Majesty,* c. 7. an. Dom. 676.

The second Nicene Council, *Let us do all things with the fear of God, asking the intercessions of the unspotted Mother of God, as also of the Angels and all the Saints,* Act. 3. 6. an. Dom. 781.

Objections

Objections ſolved.

Ob. *HOnor and glory be to God alone*, 1 Tim. 1.

Anſw. Supreme and ſoveraigne honor, true; Inferior honor, I deny it; and ſo doe S. *Paul*, ſaying, *Glory and honor, and peace to every one that doth good*, Rom. 2. 10.

Ob. *Him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, Deut. 6. 13.

Anſw. As Lord and God I grant: Yet *by charity ſerve ye one another*, Gal. 5. 13.

Ob. *One Mediator of God and men, man Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Tim. 2.

Anſw. One principal Mediator of Redemption I grant it: but many ſubordinate of interceſſion. *God gave the law in the hand of* (Moſes) *a Mediator*, Gal 3. 19. Every Pariſh Prieſt is a ſubordinate Mediator of interceſſion for his Pariſh.

Ob. *Let all the earth adore thee*, Pſal. 65.

Anſw. True, and only him as Creator, Redeemer, and Conſerver. Yet *Jacob* bleſſing his ſon *Judas*, ſaid, *Thy fathers children ſhall adore thee*, Gen. 49. 8.

Ob. *Come unto me all ye that labor*, &c. S. Matth. 11. 28.

Anſw. This excludes not ſubordinate Mediators of interceſſion, otherwiſe it would be unlawful for us to deſire our friends or Pariſh Prieſt to pray for us, contrary to that of

S. Paul, Brethren I beseech you, that you also help me in your prayers to God for me, Rom. 15. 13.

Ob. Let no man seduce you in a voluntary humility and religion of Angells, Colos. 2. 18.

Answ. It followes, *Not holding the head (Christ) of whom the whole body is compos'd*, v. 19. He writes there against a Sect of Heretiques, who offered sacrifice to Angels, and neglecting Christ esteemed them immediate and principal mediatours, independent of Christ, all this we abhominate as grosse Idolatry, this heresy was condemned long since by our Church in the Council of *Laodicea*, can. 35.

Ob. How shall they invocate in Whom they have not believed? Rom. 10. 14.

Answ. We cannot invocate any as a God, in whom we have not believed as a God, I grant: As fellow servants and mediatours of intercession to God for us, I deny: and though we believe not in the Saints as in God, yet have we also faith towards them, *Have you faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and towards all the Saints*. Epist. ad Philem. v. 5.

Ob. What I shall command thee that shalt thou do, *Deut.* c. 12. Therefore since there is no command for praying to Saints, we ought not do it.

Answ.

Answ. God spake that only in a particular case, forbidding them to imitate the sacrifices of the heathens, who sacrificed their children to the devill; as is plaine by the words immediately preceding. Not that he forbad us to practise any devotion in the Church without an expres command for it in Scripture, otherwise the invocation of the Trinity it selfe under that notion, with all publike Liturgy and set forme of prayer, as also the changing of the Saturday into Sunday, with many other things, must be laid aside; there being no expresse command in Scripture for them.

Ob. Abraham hath not known us, and Israel hath been ignorant of us, Isa. 63. 16.

Answ. He speaks there only of the knowledg of approbation, and signifies, that *Abraham* and *Israel* did not approve or own them for their Children, by reason of their sinfull and wicked ways, not that they had no knowledg at all of them; let S. *Hierom* expound this text; *Abraham knowes us not, &c. because we have offended thee, neither do they acknowledge for their children, whom they unsterstand not to be beloved of their God, &c.* So Christ said of the reprobate, and of the foolish virgins, *I know you not, S. Luke* 13. 25. *S. Mat.* 25. 12. yet you will not deny but that the knowes all things.

Ob.

Ob. S. *Peter* forbad *Cornelius* to adore him, *Acts* 10.

Answ. S. *Hierome* sayes, *He apprehended some divinity to be in* Peter, *and so did* John *in the Angel, when the Angel forbad him to adore him the first time*, Apoc. 19. We do not honor any Angel, or Saint, as God.

Ob. The Saints are dead.

Answ. *They pass from death to life*, S. John 5.24. We pray not to bodies, but souls.

Ob. The Devills are with us upon, or neere the earth, therefore, if they did see and know our actions, it would not follow that the Saints and Angells do.

Answ. Yes, it would, for spirits, which are not limited with matter, or confined to bodies, neither see, nor understand with corporal eys as we do but with their glorified understandings, which are illuminated by the light of the Lamb: And therfore cannot be hindred in their operations, by any distance of place, or interposition of Bodies.

Ob. If the Saints and Angells knew God perfectly with all his Attributes and all our actions besides, there would be no difference assignable betwixt their knowledg and Gods Omniscience.

Answ. Yes, infinite difference; because God knows not only all our actions, absolutely speaking, with all created nature (which is much

much more then hath been hitherto asserted of Saints and Angells) but also his own essence and perfections, with a most comprehensive, infinite, essentiall, and uncreated knowledg, which Saints and Angells are not capable of, their knowledg (how great soever it may be) being always limited, finite, create, and a participation only of Gods knowledg.

Quere. If there be such eviction both of Scripture, and authority, for the worship and Invocation of Angells and Saints, as you affirme, why should all Sectaries cry out so much against it?

Answ. Because, having rob'd God of that honour, which is proper to him only, to wit sacrifice, by taking away (as much as in them lies) the unbloody sacrifice of the Altar, if they should allow the outward actions, of kneeling, bowing, standing bare, and praying to Angells and Saints, they should seeme to have nothing proper to God, yet they themselves might answer this objection, because allowing, as they do, all the same actions, even to men (and that, as they professe, without robbing God of his honour) why not rather to the Angells and Saints? but one absurdity being admitted, many will follow, and so it doth with them.

ARTICLE XXI.

Of Reliques.

OUr Tenet is, *That it is also good and lawfull to give a relative honour and Veneration to the holy Reliques of Saints*; which we prove thus.

The first Argument.

1. That which God himself hath warranted, and appr ved by many famous miracles, is good and lawfull.
2. But God himselfe hath warranted and approved the honour and veneration of the Reliques of Saints by many famous miracles.
3. Therefore the honour and Veneration of the Reliques of Saints is good and lawfull.

The *maior* is proved, because it is not consistent with the goodnesse and veracity of God, to set his seal of miracles to confirme a lye,

lye, or to induce us into errour.

The *minor* is also proved, because the Woman in the Gospell was miraculously cured of her bloudy fluxe, by venerating and only touching the hem of our Saviours garment, with a belief that it would heal her, S. *Matth.* 9. 21, 22. The very shadow of S. *Peter* cured diseases in such as honoured it, and were but only shadowed by it. *Acts* 5.15. *The Napkins, and Hankerchiefs that had but touched the body of S. Paul cast out devills and cured diseases*, Acts. 19.12. The very touch of *Elisæus* his bones raised a dead man to life, 4. *Kings* 14. 21.

The second Argument.

1. All instruments of miracles wrought for our good, and moving memories or pledges of dead friends, are worthy of some honour and veneration.
2. But the holy Reliques of Saints are instruments of miracles wrought for our good, and moving memories or pledges of dead friends.
3. Therefore the holy Reliques of the Saints are worthy some honour and veneration.

The first Proposition is proved: Because the very light of nature teaches us to honour the instruments of supernaturall effects;

as is manifeſt by the practice of all Nations, whether Chriſtian or Infidell; Hence the *Turks* give ſuch honor and veneration to the tombs and aſhes of their falſe prophet *Mahomet*, and all other Heathens to the memories of their falſe gods, falſly eſteeming them the inſtruments of their good; and hence the choſen people of God in the old Law gave ſuch honor and veneration to the *Manna*, the Tables of the *Law*, *Aarons rod*, &c. *Moſes* departing out of Egypt, carried with him the bones of *Joſeph* the Patriarch, in an honorable manner, *Exod.* 13. *Joſias* commanded the bones of Gods Prophet to remain untouched, 4 *Kings* 23. All Nations honor the corps and aſhes of the dead with monuments, and decent burial. And laſtly, God himſelf honored the body of his ſervant *Moſes*, by giving it an honorable burial, *Deut.* chap. laſt.

The ſecond propoſition for the firſt part, that *reliques are inſtruments of miracles*, hath been already proved; and for the ſecond part, it is likewiſe proved: becauſe they move us to an imitation of their holy lives and actions, whileſt we behold their very bones and aſhes ſo much honored. This was the end for which all former ages erected *ſtatua's* to their renowned anceſtors, ſo to excite and move poſterity to an imitation of their vertues.

Fathers

Fathers for this point.

IN the third Age *Tertullian* numbers it amongſt the rites of Chriſtians, *To kneel to the Altars of God, under which the Reliques of the Saints were kept*, l. de pœnitent.

In the beginning of the fourth Age *Conſtantine* the great made rich offerings to the Reliques of S. *Peter* and *Paul*, Tom. 1. of the Councils, *in vita Sylveſtri.*

In the ſame Age *Euſebius* ſpeaking of S. *Iames* his wooden chaire, *It is kept* (ſaith he) *with great diligence, as a memory of holineſs delivered from Anceſtors, and is had in great reverence*, 7. Hiſtor. 14. ad finem in Ruffino 15.

In the ſame Age S. *Baſil*; *When death happens for Chriſt, the Reliques of his Saints are pretious*, in Pſal. 115.

In the ſame Age S. *Gregory Naz. Whoſe only bodies can do the ſame thing that their holy ſoules can do, whether they be touched with hands, or honored, whoſe only drops of bloud, or ſmall ſignes of their paſſion, can do the ſame things that their bodies can. Doſt thou not worſhip theſe things?* Orat. 1. in Julian. Apoſtat.

In the ſame Age S. *Chryſoſtome*; *Let us often viſit them, let us worſhip their ſepulchers, and let us touch their Reliques with great faith, that we may thence obtain ſome bleſſing.* Serm. de Sanctis Juvent. & Maximo.

In

In the ſame age S. *Ambroſe*: *But thou ſai'ſt to me, what doſt thou honor in fleſh now reſolved and conſumed? I honor in the Martyrs fleſh his ſcarres, received for the name of Chriſt*, &c. *I honor the body that ſhews me how to love our Lord, and taught me not to fear death for our Lord. Why ſhould not the faithful honor that body which even the Devils fear?* Serm. 93. in fine.

In the fifth age S. *Auguſtine*: *They bring the Reliques of moſt bleſſed* Stephen *the Martyr, which your Holineſs is not ignorant, as we alſo have done, how conveniently you ought to honour*, Epiſt. 103. And in his 22. book of the city of God he ſayes, *At the Reliques of* S. Stephen *only there were in a ſhort ſpace ſo many miracles wrought, that if all ſhould be recorded, it would fil many volumes*, &c.

Obiections ſolved.

Ob. CHriſt reproved the Jewes for adorning the ſepulchers of the Martyrs, S. *Matth.* 23.

Anſw. No, he did not reprove them for that, but for not imitating their lives, whom they counterfeited to honour, and ſhewing themſelves the children of thoſe who had murthered them, as is manifeſt by the text.

Ob. Neither the ſoules nor bodies of the Saints are in their ſepulchers, what therfore do ye honour?

Anſw.

Answ. The memorial and matter which was once in their bodies, that is there, and sufficient to excite us to a memory and imitation of them.

Ob. It is impossible that dead things, as Reliques are, should have any inherent sanctity in them.

Answ. We do not say they have, but only that they are memorials of the inherent sanctity, and holiness of the martyrs, and instruments of miracles and blessings to us; enough to make them worthy that relative honor, and veneration, which we give them.

Ob. You rather dishonour, then honour the Saints, by scattering their bones and ashes about the world.

Answ. You mistake; what ever is done by the Church in that kind, is done with an intention of honour, and much conduceth to the memory and veneration of them, through all Christendome, as also to our benefit and growth in vertue.

Ob. The worship of reliques is a meere will worship.

Answ. No, 'tis a worship of divine inspiration, witness the texts of Scripture and the authority of the Church already shew'd you.

Ob. God himself commanded *Moses* his body to be hid from the Jewes, for fear

they ſhould adore it, *Deut.* laſt verſ. 6.

Anſw. For feare they ſhould adore it with divine adoration, I grant; for the Jews after the death of *Moſes* were a people moſt prone to idolatry; but not for fear they ſhould venerate it with a relative honor; for God himſelf was pleaſed to honor it, as you have heard above.

Article

ARTICLE XXII.

Of ſacred Images.

NOte for your underſtanding this Article, that as evil thoughts are the cauſe of all our evil actions, ſo good and pious thoughts are the cauſe of all our good and pious actions. *Out of the heart* (ſaith our Saviour) *come evil thoughts, murthers adulteries, fornications*, &c. *theſe are the things which defile the ſoule, S. Matth.* 5. 19. Since therefore nothing is or can be in our underſtanding, according to Philoſophie, which is not firſt in ſome of our ſenſes, by ſome ſenſible picture, ſigne or image, from whence it is conveighed to the fantaſie and memory, and thence again to the underſtanding and will, great doubtleſs is the lawful uſe and benefit of ſacred pictures, ſignes and images, which are in us a moſt effectual nurſe of holy thoughts, deſires, and actions. Nor is there any ſenſe in man, that repreſents more effectually, then that of *ſeeing*. This preſuppoſed;

OUr Tenet is, *that it is good, lawfull, and profitable to keep the holy Pictures, or Images of Christ and his Saints, & to set them up in Churches and give them a relative honour or veneration*, which we prove thus.

The first Argument.

1. All that which is recorded in holy Scripture to have been done by the known Saints of God, (without reproofe, or any prohibition, even to this time) nay to their speciall good and benefit, is also good and profitable for us to do.
2. But it is recorded in holy Scripture, that the known Saints of God have worshipped the sacred pictures, or Images of Christ and his Saints (without reproofe or any prohibition, even to this time) nay to their special good and benefit.
3. Therefore it is also good and profitable for us to venerate and honour them, with a relative and inferiour honour.

The *major* is manifest, because their recorded

corded and approved actions are left to us for patterns and examples.

The *minor* is proved, in regard S. *John* the Baptiſt worſhipped the very latchet of our Saviours ſhooe, *the latchet of whoſe ſhooes* (ſaith he) *I am not worthy to unlooſe*, 1.27. For which fact S. *Auguſtine* on that place, concludes him to have been full of the Holy Ghoſt. *The Patriarch Jacob adored the top of Joſephs Rod*, (a ſigne or image of his regal power) *Heb.* 11.21. The Iſraelites, by venerating and looking with reverence on the braſen Serpent (a type or image of Chriſt crucified) were healed of the biting of Serpents in the deſert.

The Jews kneel'd before the pictures of the Cherubins, overſhadowing the Ark, *Exod.*25. The primitive Chriſtians venerated the very ſhadow, and garments of S. *Peter*, and *Paul*, and received ſpeciall benefit by ſo doing, *Acts* 5.15. and 19.11.

A ſecond Argument.

1. All that which God himſelfe has commanded, and no where prohibited, is good, lawfull and profitable for us to do.
2. But God himſelfe has commanded ſacred pictures, ſignes, or images, to be

made and set up with honor in the Temple, and no where prohibited it.

3. Therefore it is good, lawful, and profitable, for us to make and set them up.

The *major* is manifest, and needs no proof. The *minor* is proved. *Two Cherubins* saith God to *Moses*) *shalt thou make of beaten gold, on both sides of the Oracle*, &c. *let them cover both sides of the propitiatory*, &c. *and I will speak to thee from the two sides of the Cherubins which shall be upon the ark of the testimony, all things that I shall command the children of Israel by thee*, *Exod.* 25. 18 And when the Temple was built again by *Solomon* the two Cherubins were renewed and set in the middest of the inward Temple, 3 *Kings* 6. 24 Nor did he only command two Cherubins, but divers other carved works and images to be made on the Oracle, and the walls of the Temple, as you may see in the same chapters; *replenishing Beseleel and Oliab with his own holy Spirit, to devise whatsoever might be artificially made of gold silver, brasse, marble*, &c *Exod.* 31. He commanded the Jews to *adore the Ark*, *Psal.* 99. which is only the footstool of God, and a signe of his power, 1 *Chron.* 28. He commanded his own name to be honoured, and sanctified, *Exod.* 20. *S. Matth.* 6. *In the name of Jesus every knee bow*, &c. *Phil.* 2. 8. Now the

the name of *Jesus* is only a signe or image of our redemption, or God made man; and the name *Jehova*, of our creation, which was in so great honour with the Jews, that the common people durst not utter it, nor the Priest, but only in time of sacrifice and solemne benediction, according to *Philo* in the life of *Moses*. Nay the very Plate on which the name of God was written on the high Priests forehead, is call'd the *Plate of sacred veneration*, *Exod.* 38.26,28. finally hecommanded the Temple (which was an image of his heavenly house) to be honoured as a holy place, reproving those Priests who polluted his Sanctuary, and put no difference betwixt a holy thing and a prophane, *Ezech.* 22.26.

A third Argument.

1. All that which brings into our minds the holy mysteries and actions of Christ and his Saints, and ingraffs a love thereof in our hearts, is (doubtlesse) lawfull, good, and profitable.
2. But the frequent use and veneration of sacred Pictures, Signes, or Images doth movingly bring into our minds the holy misteries and actions of Christ and his

Saints engrafting alſo a love thereof in our hearts.

3. Therefore the frequent uſe and veneration of ſacred pictures, ſignes, or images, is doubtleſſe lawfull, good and profitable.

The *minor* (which only needs proofe,) is evinced; becauſe Pictures, ſignes, or images do of their own nature, (if often uſed, and honoured) excite to a knowledge and love of thoſe things, which they repreſent, and it is the very eſſence of an image, to repreſent another thing. 'Twas for this end the Church of God hath in all ages made artificiall pictures ſignes or images, of the nativity, miracles, life and death of Chriſt and his Saints, and ſet them up in Churches and holy places, teaching us to honour them with a relative honour or veneration, not for the matter they are made of, but for the ſacred things they repreſent, and in as much as they repreſent ſuch things being now abſent, by ſenſible and preſent objects. And this is therefore called a relative honour, becauſe it relates immediatly to the things repreſented, and either immediatly, or mediately to God himſelfe, as to our chiefeſt good, and laſt end.

A fourth Argument.

1. That which is the mark of the predeſtinate, and ſtandard or enſigne of Chriſt himſelf, is worthy of a relative honour or veneration.
2. But the Croſſe or ſacred image of Chriſt crucified, is the marke of the predeſtinate, and ſtandard, or enſigne of Chriſt.
3. Therefore the Croſſe or ſacred image of Chriſt crucified, is worthy of a relative honour, or veneration. And the like houlds with proportion, in all other images of Chtiſt, which repreſent the myſteries of his life, or paſſion.

The *major* Propoſition cannot be denied without unreaſonable wilfulneſſe.

The *minor* is proved. *Hurt ye not* (ſaith the Angel) *the earth, nor the ſea, nor the trees, till we have ſigned the ſervants of our God in their foreheads* (with the Croſſe) *Apoc.* 7. 2. All that were ſigned with the ſigne *Tau* (a type of the Croſſe) were ſaved from the exterminating Angel, *Ezech.* 9. 4. *Then* (at the day of judgment) *ſhall appear the ſigne of the Son of man* (the Croſs) *in heaven*, S. Matth. 24. 36.

Fathers

Fathers for this point.

IN the ſecond Age S. *Dionyſius*, *The ſigne of the Croſſe is ſo much honoured, that it is often uſed both in Baptiſm and other Sacraments*, l. 2. Eccleſ. Hierar. c. 2. & 5.

In the ſame Age S. *Ignatius*: *The Devil rejoyceth when any one ſhall deny the Croſſe, becauſe he well knowes the confeſſion of the Croſſe is his deſtruction, for that it is a trophie, or triumphall ark againſt his power*, Epiſt. ad Philippenſes.

In the ſame Age S. *Martial*, *Remember the Croſſe of our Lord, keep it in your mind, ſpeak often of it, have it in the ſigne, for it is your invincible armour againſt Satan*, in his Epiſtle to thoſe of *Burdeaux*.

In the third Age *Tertullian*; *In every thing we do, we ſigne our forehead with the ſigne of the Croſſe, of which practice Tradition is the defender, cuſtome the conſerver, and faith the obſerver*, l. de corona milit. c. 3. And in his time he ſayes, *The image of Chriſt bearing a lamb on his ſhoulders was graven on the chalices uſed in Churches*, l. 2. de pudicitia.

In the ſame Age *Origen*; *They are onely preſerved by the Angel whom he had ſigned with the ſigne* Tau, *that is the ſigne of the Croſſe, let*

us

us therefore lift up our hands to heaven in the likeneſs of a Croſs, ſeeing the Devils are oppreſſed, when they find us ſo armed, Hom. 8.

In the ſame Age S. *Cyprian*; *God ſhews in another place* Ezech 9.) *that thoſe only can eſcape who are born again, and have been ſigned with the ſigne of the* Croſſe, in Epiſt. ad Demet.

In the ſame Age *Lactantius* affirmes, *That when Chriſtians were preſent at the ſacrifices of the Heathens, and made the ſigne of the Croſſe, they put their gods to flight, and ſtruck them dumb*, l. Inſtitut c. 27.

In the fourth Age S. *Athanaſius*, *A man only uſing the ſigne of the Croſſe, drives away from him the deceipts of the Devil*, &c. *By it the predictions of Magicians ceaſe, and their inchantments are made void*, l. de verbo incarnato.

In the ſame Age S. *Cyril* of Hieruſalem, *Let not us be aſham'd of the Croſſe, but if any one ſhall hide it, do thou publikely ſigne thy ſelf on the forehead with it, that the Devils ſeeing the ſtandard of the King, may trembling make haſt to be gone*, Catechef 4 de vita Chriſtiana.

In the ſame Age S. *Hierome*; *We beſeech thee, O Lord, that, guarded by the ſigne of the Croſſe, and defended by the aſſiſtance thereof, we may deſerve to be free from all the deceits of the Devil*, in Pſal. 58.

In

In the ſame Age S. *Ambroſe, Chriſtian people in every moment write the contempt of death upon their foreheads* (by ſigning them with the Croſs) *for they know, that without the Croſs of our Lord they cannot be ſaved*, l. 9. Epiſt. 77.

In the fifth Age S. *Auguſtine*; *Vnleſs the ſigne of the Croſs be applied as well to the foreheads of believers, as to the water wherewith they are regenerated, and to the oyle wherewith they are annoyled, none of theſe things are rightly adminiſtred*, Tract. 118. in Joan.

S. *Palladius* (contemporary to S. *Auguſtine*) tells us, *That the Biſhop of Hieruſalem was wont yearly at the ſolemnity of Eaſter to expoſe the Croſs to be adored by the people, he himſelf firſt adoring it*, Epiſt. 11.

The ſecond Nicene Council defined, *That the ſacred images of Chriſt and his Saints are to be had and kept in Churches, and that ſaluiation or honorary worſhip may be given them, but not* Latria, *or ſoveraigne honor which belongs to God only*, Act. 7. An. Dom. 781.

Add to this, that in the Council of Epheſus, *An. Dom.* 431. S. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, who there preſided, prayed thus; *Hail Mother of God &c. through whom the precious Croſs is made famous, and adored throughout the world*, Homil. cont. Neſtorium, ſet down in the end of the ſecond Article of the ſaid Council.

Obiection

Objections ſolved.

Ob. *THou ſhalt not make to thy ſelfe any graven image*, &c. *Ex.* 20.

Anſw. You corrupt the Text; the Greek word is *Idol*, the Latine and Hebrew word is *graven thing*, &c. and it follows immediately; *to adore them* (viz. as Gods) we make no Idols, nor any graven things, or images, to adore them, as Gods, or with Gods honor, we abhor that, as damnable idolatry; we only give them a relative honour, or veneration.

Ob. Many ſay you honour them, as Gods.

Anſw. Fame is a liar you know; we do not ſo, nor yet as creatures, ſubſtances, or perſons, but only as they are meere artificial reſemblances, and repreſentations of heavenly things; and for their ſakes whom they are made to repreſent; whereas Idolatry is not committed, unleſſe the honour due to God only, (that is ſupreme, and ſoveraign honour) be given to a creature.

Ob. *Honour and glory to God alone.*

Anſw. Supreme and ſoveraigne honour, true; relative and inferior honor may be given to creatures; *Honor, and glory, and peace to every one that doth good*, Rom. 2. 10.

Ob.

Ob. *You saw not any similitude in the day that our Lord spake to you in Horeb from the midst of the fire, lest perhaps deceived you might make to your selves a graven similitude or image of male or female*, Deut 4.15.

Answ. That place onely forbids the making idols, or vain images to our selves, and therefore it followes, *Of those things which God hath forbidden thee*, vers. 23. God never forbad the making sacred images of Christ and his Saints; nay he hath commanded it, as has been proved above.

Ob. *To whom have you made God like, or What likeness will ye compare to him?* Isa. 40.18.

Answ. We intend not to picture the nature of divinity, or essence of God, that we are taught is impossible, and unlawfull to attempt; we compare not any image to him, we know all descriptions of him are infinitely short of his perfection, we only meane to represent some apparitions of God, and those in such formes or shapes, as he himselfe hath pleased to appear in, or else represent some attribute of his by some analogical similitude; as his unspeakable *goodness*, by a *Stork*, which has no tongue; his *Eternity* by a *circle*, which has neither beginning nor end, or by the image of an old man, as he appear'd to *Daniel*, *Dan.* 7.

Ob.

Ob. Whereunto have you resembled me and made me equall, and compared mee? Isa.46.5.

Answ. This is also against Idols only (as is plaine by the text) which were made equal to God. And therefore it follows immediately, *Bringing a Goldsmith, to make a God.*

Ob. Certainly you adore your images in the same manner the Heathens did their Idols.

Answ. Be not wilfull in your uncharitable mistakes; we do not, they adored their Idols as gods, and offer'd sacrifice to them. *Make us Gods* (say they) *which may go before us*, Exod.31.1. *He cut down cedars, and kindled the fire, and baked bread*, &c. *but of the rest he made a God, and adored*, Isa.44.15. *They praised their Gods of silver, of brass, of wood, and of stone*, Dan.5.4. *They have made to themselves a molten calf, and adored and immolated to it*, Exod. 32.8. *They sacrificed to the idols of Canaan*, Psal.105.38. We do not sacrifice to images, nor worship them as Gods; no, we abhorre and renounce it.

Ob. Some of your Divines hold it lawful to worship the Cross with soveraigne honor.

Answ. By or for it self I deny; by accident, and as it makes one thing, with Christ crucified, whom they conceive, as hanging on

on it, I grant ſome Divines hold; but this is a meer School opinion, and not of faith with us: Nay, the ſeventh general Council, which we all ſubmit to, hath decreed, *That the image of Chriſt is not to be adored with ſoveraign honor, nor otherwiſe, then the Books of the Goſpel*, Act. 7. and laſt, Can. 3. Urge not therefore what ſome particular Divines may ſay, but hearken to the doctrine of Gods Church, that we rely upon.

Ob. You call the Croſs, *O holy Croſs*, &c.

Anſw. In as much as it repreſents the holy paſſion of Chriſt, I grant; ſo you call the Bible the holy Bible, and the Communion Table the holy Communion Table,

Ob. You pray in one of your Hymnes, *O Croſs, our only hope*, &c.

Anſw. 'Tis a Poetical Figurative expreſſion, in which by the Croſs we ſpeak to Chriſt himſelf, who hung and died on it for our ſins. So the Prophet, *Hear O heavens, and hearken O earth!* *Deut.* 32. 1. In which addreſs, by the words, *heaven and earth*, he ſpake to the inhabitants of heaven and earth; which kind of ſpeech is frequent in the Scripture, eſpecially the Pſalms, that are Poetical. Give the Church therfore leave in this to imitate her Teacher the Holy Ghoſt. And for the words, *Our only hope*, the Croſs is no other-

otherwiſe, *our only hope*, then it was S. *Pauls only glory. God forbid, I ſhould glory, but in the Croſſe of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, Gal. 6. 14. That is, inſtrumentally, as it was the only inſtrument of our Redemption, or by accident, as it makes one thing with Chriſt, bleeding and dying on it.

Ob. Two Councils at Conſtantinople under *Leo Iconomicus* and *Conſtantinus Copronimus* defined againſt images.

Anſw. They were not General Councils nor approved; neither the Pope, nor any of the Patriarks were preſent either by themſelves or Legates.

Ob. The Council of *Frankford* condemned images.

Anſw. There is no ſuch decree to be found in any antient Author, nor was that council approved in any thing, but only in her decrees concerning Church benefits, as the Centuriſts themſelves confeſs with one conſent.

Ob. The Council of *Eliberis* forbids the making images in Churches.

Anſw. You miſtake, it only forbids making them on Church wals in time of perſecution, leſt Infidels ſhould prophane, and deface them.

The Gentiles calumniated the Croſs, of ſuperſtition and witchcraft, as the modern Sectaries do; *Simon Magus*, *Cerinthus*, and *Baſilides* taught, *that Chriſt was not truly crucified, but withdrew himſelf from the Croſs, ſuffering only in a phantaſticall image, and therefore they denied all honor to the Croſs.* See S. Irenæus l. 1. c. 25. de hæreſ. S. Epiphanius hæreſ. 24. 28. The *Nicolaites*, *Cleobulus*, and *Theodore* denied the Croſs, & taught, that *Chriſtians ought not to give any reverence to it, or to the images of the Apoſtles and other Saints, affirming that they themſelves were immediately ſent from God* (the common pretence of all Heretikes) *to reform the World.* See S. *Epiphanius*, *l.* 3. *de hæreſibus*, *hæreſ.* 21, 22.

The Manichees taught that *no images were to be worſhipped*, as witneſſeth *Taraſius* in the ſecond Nicen Councill, and S. *Auguſtine* l. 20. cont. Fauſtum c. 15. *Arrius* denied *that any worſhip was to be given to the images of Chriſt and his Saints*, as you may read in the ſeventh general Synod. The great Apoſtata *Julian* ſet up his own image in the place of the holy Croſs, and cried out againſt Chriſtians, *O wretched men, who adore the Croſs, and imprint the ſigne of it on their foreheads, and before their doors*, as S. *Cyril* of Alexandria relates, *l.* 6. *cont. Julian*,

Julian, which image of *Julian* was burnt with lightning from heaven. These were all arch-heretikes; let therfore all deluded people take notice who they were that hated the Crosſ and holy images.

ARTICLE XXIII.

Of free Will.

OUr Tenet is, *That man (even in the ſtate of corrupted nature) as aſſiſted by the efficatious Grace of God, hath free will to do, or not to do, not only natural and moral, but alſo works belonging to his eternal ſalvation, and to commit or avoid evils; and that he is not enforced to do good, or avoid evil, by the ſaid efficatious grace, though ſweetly and infallibly determined to it.* Which we prove thus.

The firſt Argument.

1. In all thoſe things, in which men have election, they have free will.
2. But men, aſſiſted by the efficatious grace of God, have election not only in their moral and natural actions, but alſo in their

their ſupernatural, and things belonging to eternal life and the avoiding ſin.

3. Therefore men, aſſiſted by the efficatious grace of God, have *free will* not only in their moral and natural actions, but alſo in their ſupernatural, and things belonging to eternal life, and the avoiding ſin.

The *major* Prop. is proved, becauſe *Election* is defined, *A deliberate appetency with conſultation*, which of neceſſity implies freedome.

The *minor* Propoſition is proved; *Choice is given you, chooſe this day that which pleaſeth you*, Joſh. 24. *Choice is given thee* (ſaith our Lord to *David*) *chooſe one of three which thou wilt*, 2 King. 24. *If thou doſt ill, ſhall not thy ſin be forthwith preſent at the door? but the luſt* (or deſire) *thereof ſhal be under thee, and thou ſhalt have dominion over it*, Gen. 4. 6, 7. ('tis in our power to do, or not to do it.) *I have propoſed to you life and death, bleſſing and curſing, chooſe therefore life that thou mayeſt live*, Deut. 30. verſ. 17, 18, 19. *How often* (ſaith our Lord) *would I gather thy children, &c. and thou wouldeſt not*, Matth. 23. 37. *You alwayes reſiſt the Holy Ghoſt*, Acts 7. 51. *But as many as received him* (Chriſt) *he gave them power to be made the ſons of God*, S. John 1. 12. (they were inabled by his grace

to be made such, if they themselves would) *He that hath determined in his heart, not having necessity, but having power of his own will, to keep his virgin, doth well,* 1 Cor. 7. 37. (S. Paul thought it in the free power of our will to keep, or not to keep it.) *God from the beginning made man, and left him in the hand of his own counsell.* Eccles. 15.

A second Argument.

1. Almighty God who can do nothing in vaine, and is no tirant, but the Father of mercie, exhorts and commands us to do good, and avoid evil, threatning to damne us, if we neglect.
2. But it were altogether vaine to exhort or command any such things, and tiranny to damne us for not doing them, unlesse it were in our free power, to do, or not to do them.
3. Therefore it is in our free power (as inabled by Gods grace) to do, or not to do them.

The *major* is manifest to all that know the Scripture, which is indeed nothing else, but a divine book of holy precepts and exhortations to do good, and abstaine from evill, with

with great rewards and punishments annexed of everlasting salvation, or damnation.

The *minor* is proved. Because nothing can be more vaine then to spend much time in exhorting or commanding that, which is not in our power, or possible for us to do (it were as rational to preach to the dead, or to command a man, that had no legs, to run) neither can any thing be more tirannical, then to damne us, for not doing it, since no man can be bound, without extremity of injustice, to that which is impossible.

Fathers for this point.

IN the second Age S. *Ignatius*; *If any man do wickedly, he is a man of the Devil, not made so by nature, but by the arbitrement of his own mind,* In Epist. ad Magn.

In the same age S. *Irenæus*; *Not onely in works, but even in faith hath Almighty God reserved liberty of will to man, saying, Be it done to thee according to thy faith,* l. 4. c. 72. And again, *If therefore it were not in us to do these things, or not to do them, what cause has the Apostle or our Lord himself long before to counsel us to do certain things, and to abstain from others, but*

becauſe man had free will from the beginning. in the ſame ch.

In the third age, S. Ciprian, *the freedom of believeing or not believeing is placed in the will.* in. Deut. &c. l. 3. ad Quirin. c. 52.

In the ſame Age, Origen, And *now O Iſrael What doth thy Lord God require from thee; Let them be aſhamed of thoſe words, who deny free will in man; how ſhould God require from man, unleſſe man had in his power what to offer to God requiring.* Homil. 12. in num.

In the fourth Age, S. Hierom; *becauſe thou haſt free will, I warne thee, that ſin have no dominion over thee, but thou over ſin*, queſt. in Geneſ.

In the ſame age S. Chryſoſtome, *the Lord of all things hath made our nature to have free will &c. thus therfore now is alſo done in Cain*, Homil. 19. in Geneſ. c 4.

In the ſame age S. *Baſil* on thoſe words, *If you will, and will hear mee, Iſa.* 1. 19. *In this place* (ſaith he) *eſpecially he ſets before our eyes the liberty of will to be given to mans nature.*

In the ſame age S. Auguſtine, *God hath revealed to us in holy Scripture, that in man there is free will, firſt becauſe Gods commandements themſelves would not profit man, unleſs he had free will whereby to do them, &c.* lib. de grat. & libero arbitrio. cap. 2. *To conſent* (ſaith he) *or not to conſent, lies in a mans owne*

will,

will, lib. de ſpiritu & litera. cap. 34. *If we will, it is, if we will not, it is not*, l. 5. de Civitate Dei. c. 10. *It is in a mans power to change his will*, l. 1. retract. c. 22. *Who will not cry out it is a fooliſh thing to give Commandements to him, who hath not freedom to do what is commanded, and that it is an injury to condemne him, who had not power to fulfill them.* l. de fide contra Manichæos. c. 10.

The fourth *Toletan* Council defined, *that man by his free will obeying the Serpent periſhed, and ſo the grace of God calling, by the converſion of his own minde, every man by believing is ſaved, therefore not by force, but by the free will of the minde they are to be perſwaded to be converted*, c. 57. de Judæis. Anno dom. 681.

The Council of *Sens* declared, *this Hereſy, wholly taking away the Will, We do not ſo much condemne*, (it being already long ſince condemned by the Church and Councils) *as we declare it contrary to plaine teſtimonies of Scripture*, c. 15. de l. Arab. Anno Dom. 1431.

Objections ſolved.

Ob. I *Know, Lord, that mans way is not his own, neither is it in man to direct his own ſteps. Jerem.* 10.

Anſw. It is not his own alwaies in order to execution

execution, I grant, for so it may be hindred divers waies; it is not his own in order to election, in which freedom essentially consists, I deny; nor can he direct his own steps, without the assistance of divine grace; with that assistance, I deny it.

Ob. All our works thou hast wrought to us (or in us) Isa.26.12. and the Apostle saies *who worketh all things according to the counsel of his will*, 1.Cor.12.11.

Answ. These places only prove Gods cooperation with us in all our actions, which doth not exclude nor destroy, but rather perfect the freedom of our wills; we acknowledg we are not able to do any good thing, without his aid of grace, neither can we see without light, yet light neither hurts nor takes away, but perfects our faculty of seeing.

Ob. No man can come to me, unless the Father that sent me draw him. S.Jo.6.44.

Answ. Here the Maniches (saith S.Crysostome) *rise up contending by the testimony of this text, that we can do nothing our selves; but this takes not away our free will but shewes it needs Gods help. In Johan: Homil.45.* and on the same place, *Wherefore it is evident, that it is in our choice, whether wee will be saved or damned*, Hom.46.

Ob.

Ob. *It is God that works in you both to will and to accompliſh.* Phil. 2. 13.

Anſw. *Not becauſe he ſaid, It is God that works in you both to will and to accompliſh, &c. is he therefore thought to have taken away free will? if it were ſo, he would not have ſaid before, with fear and trembling work ye your ſalvation; for when there is command that they work, their free will is called upon.* Thus S. *Auguſtine* on this place.

Ob. We are dead by ſin, Epheſ. 2.

Anſw. But quickned by Chriſt, ibidem.

Ob. It is neceſſary that Scandals come, S. Math. 18. 7. *It is impoſſible that ſcandals ſhould not come, S. Lu.* 17. Therefore it is impoſſible for us to avoid them.

Anſw. I deny the conſequence, theſe texts only infer a neceſſity of ſuppoſition, becauſe God hath foreſeen and foretold they will come, which hinders them not from being freely done, ſpeaking of abſolute freedom, and as they are compar'd to the immediate, and ſecond cauſes.

Ob. God neceſſarily and infallibly foreknows all things that will ever come to paſſe. Therefore whatſoever we do, we do by unavoidable neceſſity.

Anſw. I deny your conſequence, for God not

not only foresees effects, but also their causes and that they will proceed, and be done, according to their exigence; from free causes freely and from necessary causes necessarily; so that all which God foresees to be done, will infalibly be done, yet not necessarily or by compulsion, because his foresight doth not impose on things foreseen, any absolute necessity, but only a necessity of supposition, which is consistent with absolute freedom, or liberty.

Ob. God hath by his will decreed from all eternity whatever will be done.

Answ. True; according to the natural exigence of second causes, but not contrary to it; and therefore he hath decreed many things to be done freely.

Article

ARTICLE XXIV.

Of ſaving or juſtifying faith.

OUr Tenet is, *That juſtifying faith is not a confident undoubted beliefe, that our ſins are forgiven, and that we are of the elect, (as Sectaries hold) but a true faith, in* Jeſus Chriſt, *God and man, and ſtedfaſt beliefe of all thoſe things which he hath any way revealed to us*; which we prove thus.

The firſt Argument.

1. That cannot be a ſaving or juſtifying faith, which was not taught the Church for ſuch, by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.
2. But Proteſtants foreſaid faith of ſpecial mercy (by which they aſſuredly believe, their ſins are forgiven, and that they are of the elect) was never taught the Church for ſuch, by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

3. Therefore

3. Therefore Protestants faith of special mercy, is not a saving or justifying faith.

The *major* is manifest, because Christ and his Apostles were the masters and teachers of all saving and justifying faith.

The *minor* is proved; because they never taught the Church, to have assured beliefe, that their sins were forgiven, or that they were of the Elect, as any certaine or necessary means of their salvation, but rather the quite contrary. *Man knoweth not whether he be, worthy love or hatred*, Eccles. 9.1. *Who can say my heart is clean, I am pure from sin*, Pro. 20. *Sins who understandeth, from my secret sins cleanse me*, Psalm. 18. *Therefore, my dearest, with fear and trembling work out your salvation*, Philip. 2.12. *I am not guilty in conscience of any thing, but herein I am not justified*, 1 Cor. 4.4. *In fear converse ye the time of your sojourning*, 1: Pet. 1. Nor is there any Article of the Creed, or any verse of the whole Gospel, which teacheth this presumptuous Faith of special mercy.

The second Argument, affirmative.

2: That is the holy saving or justifying Faith of Christians, which Christ and his Apostles taught the Church, for a necessary means

meanes to juſtice and ſalvation.

2. But Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught the Church for a neceſſary meanes of juſtice and ſalvation, a Faith in him, true God and man, by which all thoſe things are firmly believed, which he hath any way revealed to us, and working alſo by Charity.

3. Therefore a Faith in Chriſt, true God and man, by which all thoſe things are firmly believed which he hath any way revealed to us, and working alſo by charity, is the only ſaving or juſtifying Faith of Chriſtians.

The *major* is manifeſt of it ſelfe.

The *minor* is proved. *Without Faith, it is impoſſible to pleaſe God; for he that cometh to God, muſt firſt believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder to them that ſeeke him,* Heb. 11. 6. *In him* (Chriſt) *every one that believeth is juſtified,* Acts. 13. 39.

Jeſus ſaid I am the reſurrection, and the life, he that believeth in me although he be dead he ſhall live &c. believeſt thou this? She ſaith to him, Lord I have believed, that thou art Chriſt the Son of God who art come into the world. S. Iohn. 11. 25, 27. *Peter anſwered and ſaid, Thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God, and Jeſus ſaid unto him, bleſſed art thou Simon Barjona,*

jona, &c. S. Math. 16. 17. (viz. by reason of that Faith) *This is the word of Faith which we preach, for if thou confesse with thy mouth our Lord Jesus Christ, and believe with thy heart, that God hath raised him up from the dead; thou shalt be saved*, Rom. 10. 9. add to this, that Article of the Creed, *and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord*; without which Faith, no justice nor salvation can be had.

That it must also work by charity, is proved; because Faith without charity is dead, and profits not to justice. *You see then brethren* (saith S. James) *how that by works a man is justified and not by Faith only*, S. James. 2. 17, 21. *If a man have all Faith and have not charity, he is nothing, it profits nothing*, 1 Cor. 13. *For in Christ Jesus neither Circumcision availeth ought, nor prepuce, but Faith that worketh by charity*, Galath. 5. 6. *Not every one that saies Lord, Lord, but he that doth the will of my Father shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*, S. Math, 7. 21. To conclude; *Go ye teaching all Nations, baptizing them and teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* S. Math. 28 19 20. We must believe, and do accordingly; wee must believe the divinity, humanity, life, death, miracles and doctrines of Jesus Christ. *He that believeth not, shall be condemned*, S. Mark. 16. 26.

Fathers

Fathers for this Point.

In the ſecond Age St. *Clement*, *Wherefore when we heare, thy faith hath made thee ſafe, we doe not underſtand him to ſay abſolutely, that thoſe are ſaved who any waies believe, unleſs their deeds ſhall follow.* l. 4. Strommatum poſt med.

In the third Age, Origen, *Thoſe that profeſſe faith in Jeſus, but doe not prepare themſelves with good works to ſalvation, are to be compared to the fooliſh virgins.* Tract. 32. in Matth.

In the ſame Age, St. Cyril of Alexandria, *That faith doth not ſuffice to ſalvation, the Diſciple of Chriſt ſheweth, writing, Thou believeſt there is one God, the divels alſo believe and tremble; if therefore only faith were ſufficient, the multitude of devils could not periſh: wherefore the works of charity muſt come to faith.* In c. 2. Jacobi, v. 29.

In the fourth Age, St. Chryſoſtom, *If Paul who ſuffered ſo much, was not yet ſecure of that reſurrection, (viz. to glory) what ſhall we ſay?* Homil. 2. in Epiſt. ad Philip. And again, *If thou ſhalt rightly believe, &c. but doſt not rightly live, it doth nothing profit thee to ſalvation.* Homil. 30. in Joan. & Math. 7.

In the ſame Age, St. Hierome, *I have found*

the works of the juſt to be in the hand of God; but whether they be loved of God or not, now they cannot know, in cap. 9. Eccleſ. v. 1. And again, *Therefore it is but doubtfull and uncertain*, (to wit, whether God wil convert and forgive) *that whilſt men are doubtfull of their ſalvation, they may ſeriouſly do penance*. In c. 3. Jonæ v. 9.

In the ſame Age, St. Cyril of Hieruſalem, *Do not truſt in this only that thou believeſt, but keep faith burning, that thy light may ſhine before men by good works*, Catechiſ. 15.

In the fifth Age, St. Auguſtine, *What man knoweth he is to perſevere to the end in the progreſſe of juſtice, unleſs by ſome revelation he be aſſured from God?* l. 2. de civitat. Dei. c. 2. And again, *Who among all the faithfull, as long as he liveth in this mortality, can preſume himſelfe to be of the number of the predeſtinate? becauſe it is neceſſary to be hid in this place, where pride is to be taken off*. l. de corrept. & grat. c. 13. *Faith truely may be without charity, but not profit*. l. 15. de Trinitat. c. 18. And finally, *I know that the juſtice of my God remaineth; whether mine remain or no, I know not*, in Pſal. 40. *And far was it from the Apoſtles meaning that faith is ſufficient for a man, although he have no good works*. l. de grat. & lib. arbit. c. 7.

The Council of Moguntia defined, *Without*

out faith we cannot please God; notwithstanding faith needeth works, because faith without works is dead. Can. 1. Anno dom. 813.

You see what kind of faith the Fathers required to justice; not faith alone, or faith of special mercy, but faith in Jesus Christ working by charity.

Objections solved.

Obj. *The Spirit himselfe giveth testimony to our spirit that we are the sonnes of God;* Rom. 10.

Answ. It gives not testimony that we are the sonnes of God, by believing so only, or by assuring our selves that our sins are forgiven us; but by and through a faith in *Iesus Christ*, working by charity; and though his testimony be alwaies infallible in it selfe; yet it is alwaies doubtfull, and uncertain on our part; whether we have, or have it not, without special revelation. And therefore many say *Our Father*, and think themselves the sonnes of God, who are indeed the sons of the divel, as Christ proved to the Jewes, St. *Iohn* 7.

Obj. *Paul* says, *I am sure that neither life nor death, &c. shall separate us from the charity of God, &c.* Rom. 8.

Answ. He doth not say, That this assurance justified him. No, it presupposed him in state of justice: and he either speaks there of such only as be predestinate, or else by the words (*I am sure*) he means no more then I am confidently perswaded; neither can we without presumptuous pride, pretend to such assurance in that behalfe as holy *Paul* in likelihood might have.

Obj. *Know you not your selves that Christ Jesus is in you, unless perhaps you be reprobates?* 2 Cor. 13. 5.

Answ. He speaks only there of Christs being present with the Corinthians, not in respect of justifying grace (for both in this and three precedent Chapters, he threatens them with heavy vengeance for their sins) but in his speciall power, providence, and miracles shewed to them.

Ob. A man is justified in Baptisme, and that without any works.

Answ. Without external works, or works pretending justice, I grant; those are not alwaies requisite to the first justice, without internal works, or at least works consequent to justice (speaking of such who have the use of reason) I deny.

Obj. *If a man have not a care of his own, and especially Domesticals, he hath denyed the*

the faith, according to *St. Paul.*

Anſw. He hath denied it in his deeds, as many doe, but may notwithſtanding have true, though not juſtifying faith; a man may have all faith (in St. *Pauls* ſuppoſition, 1 *Cor.*13.) and no charity.

Obj. *He that ſays he knows God, and doth not keep his Commandements, is a lyar.*

Anſw. If he ſay he knows him with friendly or informed faith, I grant it; and of ſuch only St. *Iohn* there ſpeaks. Hence it is, that your faith only, or faith of ſpeciall mercy, wil not ſuffice to juſtifie.

Obj. *Every one that believeth that Ieſus is Chriſt, is born of God*, 1 Joan. 5. Therefore juſtified.

Anſ. He ſpeaks of Faith formed with Charity, and ſo I grant your conſequence. Here is no excluſive particle; he ſays not, *He that beleeveth only.*

Ob. *The Saints by Faith overcame kingdoms*, Heb. 2.

Anſw. Not by faith only, but by faith joynd with Hope and Charity.

Ob. *We account a man to be juſtified by Faith, without the works of the Law*, Rom. 3. 28. Therefore by Faith excluding all works.

Anſw. St. *Paul* excludes there only the Ceremonial works of the Old law, of which ſome

ſome boaſted much, or works preceding faith, and done by the meere ſtrength of nature; he excludes not the works of grace and charity, or works which follow faith. So that your conſequence is erroneous. *Some* (ſaith St. Auguſtine in one place) *not underſtanding what the Apoſtle ſaith, have ſuppoſed his meaning to be, That Faith is ſufficient for a man though he live nickedly, and have no works: but far was that from the intention of the veſſel of election.* l. de grat. & lib. arbit. c. 7. And in another place, *Paul ſpeaks of works that goe before faith* (we doe not hold that thoſe wil juſtifie. *Iames ſpeaks of works which follow faith*, theſe doe juſtifie) l. 83. q. 76. in fine, & l. de fide & operib. c. 14.

Ob. *Believe only, and ſhe ſhall be ſaved*, St. Lu. 8. 50.

Anſw. He only there promiſeth corporal life and ſafety to the Princes daughter of the Synagogue for her fathers faith; not ſpiritual life and ſafety of the ſoul. Which is not againſt us; we doubt not but corporall bleſſings may be given for faith only, and faith is alwaies required to Juſtice, but not ſufficient without Charity.

Ob. *All that believe in him ſhall not periſh, but have eternall life.* St. John 3. 14.

Anſw. If he want not ſome other thing as requiſite as faith, I grant it. So *all that hope*

in

in him, ſhall not be confounded, Eccleſ. 2. Yet neither Faith nor Hope, nor both together, wil ſuffice to juſtifie without *Charity*. There be many particular and inadequat cauſes of Juſtification; and the Scripture ſometimes attributes the whole effect to one of them, and ſometimes to another; but never ſo to any one as to exclude the reſt, but rather as including and ſuppoſing them.

Article

ARTICLE XXV.

Of the merit of Works.

OUr Tenet is, *That our beſt works (in this ſtate of corrupted nature) as they are ours preciſely, are not meritorious of a reward from God; becauſe we can doe no good thing our ſelves, as of our ſelves, but our ſufficiency is all from him; yet as proceeding from the grace of Chriſt working in us, and with us, and elevated by his merits, and promiſes; ſo he hath promiſed a reward to them, and made them worthy a reward.* Which is all we intend by the *merit of Works*. And is proved thus:

The firſt Argument.

1. To merit a reward from God (according

ding to the Churches notion and expoſition of it in this place) is nothing elſe but to be worthy and challenge a reward from God by contract.

2. But our good workes, as done by us in ſtate of grace, relying on the promiſes of Chriſt, and elevated by his grace and merits, are worthy, and do challenge a reward from God by contract.

3. Therefore our Good works, as done by us in ſtate of grace, relying on the promiſes of Chriſt, and elevated by his grace and merits, doe merit a reward from God.

The firſt Propoſition is manifeſt, unleſſe you wil obtrude your meaning and explication on the Church, and not accept of the Churches explication of her own words.

The ſecond Propoſition is proved: *Bleſſed are ye when they ſhall revile and perſecute you, &c. for my ſake: rejoyce and be glad; for very great is your reward in Heaven*, St. Math. 5. 12. *Whoſoever ſhall give to one of theſe little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a diſciple, Amen I ſay unto you, he ſhall not loſe his reward*, St. Math. 10. 42. *The ſon of man is to come in the glory of his father, and then ſhall he render to every man according to his works*, Apoc. c. laſt, v. 12. *I have fought a good fight, there is a crown of juſtice laid up for me, which*

our

our Lord wil render to me at that day, a juſt judge: and not only to me, but to them alſo that love his comming; 2 Tim. 4. 7, 8. *They ſhall walk with me in white, becauſe they are worthy*; Apoc. 3. 4. *God hath tried them, and found them worthy of himſelfe*, Wiſd. 3. *That ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which alſo ye ſuffer*, 2 Theſ. 1. 5. *Come ye bleſſed of my father, and poſſeſs ye the Kingdom, &c. for I was hungry, and ye gave me to eate, &c.* St. Matth. 25. 14, 15. You ſee the Covenant or contract is plainly made, and the reward as plainly promiſed, which of neceſſity implies merit, ſeeing a reward and merit are correllatives.

A ſecond Argument.

1. God hath freely bound himſelfe by Covenant and promiſe to reward our good works proceeding from the grace, and dignified by the merits of Chriſt, with grace and glory; then of neceſſity it followes that our good works, proceeding from his grace, and dignified by his merits, doe merit a reward of grace and glory.

2. But God hath freely bound himſelfe to this by covenant and promiſe.

3. Therefore our good works proceeding from

from the grace of Christ, and dignified by his merits, do merit a reward of grace and glory.

The ſequel of the Major is proved, becauſe a faithful promiſe makes a due debt, and the Workman is worthy his wages, promiſed by covenant.

The Minor is proved by all the Texts above cited; as alſo the Parable in the twentieth Chapter of *Saint Matthew*, where Chriſt in the perſon of an Houſholder agrees with the workmen in his Vineyard for a penny a day; that is, Everlaſting Life, as all the Fathers expound it. And Saint *Paul* tells us, *God is not unjuſt that he ſhould forget your work and love which you have ſhewed in his Name*, Heb. 6. 10.

Fathers for this Point.

In the ſecond Age Saint *Ignatius*, *Give me leave to become the food of beaſts, that by that meanes I may merit and win God.* Epiſt. to the Romans.

In the ſame Age *Juſtin Martyr*, *We think that men, who by works have ſhewed themſelves worthy of the will and counſail of God, ſhall by their merits live and reigne with him.* Apolog. 2.

In the ſame Age *Irenæus*, *We eſteem that*

crown

crown to be precious, which is gotten by combat and ſuffering for Gods ſake. lib. 4. cont. hæreſ. cap. 72.

In the third Age Saint *Cyprian, If the day of our return ſhall find us unloaden, ſwift, and running in the way of good works, our Lord will not faile to reward our merits.* Serm. de Eleemoſyna.

In the fourth Age Saint *Baſil, ſhew thy works and exact a reward.* Orat. ad divites.

In the ſame Age Saint *Ambroſe; Is it not evident, that there remains after this life, either rewards for merits, or puniſhment.* l. 1. de Officiis c. 15.

In the fifth Age Saint *Auguſtine, He* (Paul) *ſayes that our Lord a juſt Judge will render to him a Crown: he therefore owes it, and as a juſt Judge will pay it; for the work being regarded, the reward cannot be denied.* l. 50. Homil. 4.

And againe, *Our Lord hath made himſelfe a debtor, not by receiving, but by promiſing; it is not ſaid to him, render what thou haſt received, but what thou haſt promiſed,* in Pſalm 83. and in another place, *They give the price of their own ſoules, who ceaſe not to give Alms.* in Pſalm 48. v. 8.

The *Arauſican* Council defined a thouſand years agoe, *That reward is debt to good works if they be done, but grace which was not debt*

pre-

precedes that they may be done. Can. 18.

The *Lateran* Council defines, *If any man ſhall ſay, that the good works of a juſtified man which are done by him, through the grace of God, and the merits of Chriſt, do not merit an encreaſe of grace and glory, everlaſting life and the obtaining thereof, if he die in ſtate of grace, be he Anathema.* Ch. Firmiter de ſum. Trinitate *an. dom.* 1215. the ſame is defined in the Council of *Florence, decreto de Purgatorio.*

Objections Solved.

Obj. Heaven and Everlaſting Life is an inheritance, *If Sons, then Heirs, &c.* Rom. 8. therfore not a reward.

Anſw. I grant the antecedent, but deny the conſequence; it is alſo a reward and crown to ſuch as labour and fight for it. *Whatſoever ye do, work it from the heart, as to our Lord, &c. knowing ye ſhall receive a reward from our Lord,* Coloſ. 3. 23, 24. And *no man ſhall be crowned, but he that hath fought lawfully.*

Obj: Everlaſting life is the grace of God, Rom. 6. 23. *And the paſſions of this life are not condigne to future Glory,* Romans 8. 18.

Anſw. It is therefore called the Grace of God

God, becanſe gratis and freely promiſed to our works, which could not otherwiſe deſerve it, as alſo becauſe he gives us grace, whereby to merit and obtain it, without which we could not do it. Yet it is alſo a reward of juſtice, 2 *Tim.* 4. And to the ſecond place objected, I Anſwer, we hold not our works or ſufferings to be abſolutely condigne to future glory, or equal in rigorous, but only in a Geometrical proportion, which requires no more but a reaſonable correſpondence of one thing to another, which is here found, ſo that *our preſent tribulation worketh above meaſure an immenſe weight of glory in us*, 2 Cor. 4. 17.

Obj. When ye have done all thoſe things that are commanded you, ſay we are unprofitable ſervants, Luke 17. 10.

Anſw. We are unprofitable of our ſelves, and as ſervants under the ſervitude of ſin, I grant; but as fellow-Citizens of the *Saints*, Friends and Heirs of God, aſſiſted by his grace and by the merits of Chriſt, I deny; and ſo does Saint *Paul*, ſaying, *If any man ſhall cleanſe himſelf from theſe* (ſins) *he ſhall be a veſſel unto honour, ſanctified and profitable to our Lord*, 2 Tim. 2. 2. *Well done good and faithful ſervant, &c. but the unprofitable ſervant* (take heed Proteſtants) *caſt ye forth into outward Darkneſs.* Matth. 25. 21. *O the great good-*

goodneſſe of God (ſaith St. Auguſtine) *to whom when we did owe ſervitude by the condition of our eſtate, as bondmen to their Lords, yet hath he promiſed us the reward of friends.* Sermone de verbis Apoſtoli.

Obj. *Thy boaſting hath been excluded; by what law? by the law of deeds? no; but by the law of faith.* Rom. 3. 27.

Anſw. St. Auguſtine: *Paul ſpeaks onely of the works of Abraham, in as much as they proceeded from the law, ſecluding the ſpirit and grace of Chriſt.* l. de fide & operib. c. 14.

Obj. Chriſt himſelfe reprehends mercenaries, St. *John* 20. Therefore it is not lawfull to doe good workes for a reward.

Anſw. I deny the conſequence: Mercenaries doe their good works ſolely, or at leaſt chiefly for a reward; we doe ours chiefly for the love of God, and ſecondarily onely for a reward, as *David* himſelf did: *I have inclined my heart to do thy juſtifications for ever for a reward.* Pſalm 119. v. 112.

Obj. There can be no juſtice between God and man.

Anſw. Rigorous juſtice, I grant; Analogical juſtice, which is ſufficient to merit,

I deny. *There is a Crown of justice*, as you have heard; and *David* tels you, *Our Lord will render to me according to my justice, because I have kept the waies of our Lord.* Psalm 18. 20, 21.

Article

ARTICLE. XXVI.

Of Vows.

A Vow is defined to be *a religious promiſe made to God of ſome better thing:* that is, of ſomething which is better to be done, then omitted. This premiſed,

Our Tenet is, *That it is a good and pious practice, and much conducing to perfection* (though not neceſſary to ſalvation) *to make Vows to God of Poverty, Chaſtity, Obedience, and other vertues, and good works.* Which we prove thus:

The firſt Argument.

1. All that is taught us, and commended in the holy Scriptures, is very good and pious for us to practice.

2. But Vows are taught us, and commended (not onely in themſelves but unto us) in the holy Scripture.

3. Therefore it is good and pious for us to practice them.

The *Minor* (which only needs proof,) is proved. *They ſhall vow vowes unto our Lord, and pay them.* Iſa. 19.21. *Jacob vow'd a vow to God* (Viz. to erect an Altar and offer Tyths) Gen.28. *David vow'd a Vow to the God of Iacob* (namely, to build a Temple to his name.) *Pſal.* 13.12. *Vow ye, and render ye to the Lord your God.* Pſal. 75.2.

A Second Argument.

1. To vow thoſe things which are commended and councell'd (though not commanded) by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, is a moſt pious and Religious practice.

2. But Evangelical poverty, perpetual chaſtity, and voluntary obedience, are councell'd and commended (though not commanded) by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

3. Therefore to vow them, is a pious and Religious practice.

The *Major* is proved, becauſe freely to bind our ſelves by Vow, for the meer love of God, to an obſervance and practice of ſuch vertues as God himſelf hath not commanded but only councelled, is a great argument of our gratitude towards God, and pious zeal of his honour.

The *Minor* is proved, as to *Poverty* thus: *If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me, and thou shalt have treasure in Heaven.* Mat. 19.21. *The multitude of Believers had one heart, one soul, neither did any of them call ought their own of those things which they possessed,* Acts 4. 32. Which abnegation (as St. *Augustin* tells us) was made by vow, *Serm.* 1. *de communi vita Clericorum. Ananias* and his wife *Saphira* had vow'd to give all they had to God. *Acts* 5. according to the Fathers on that place; otherwise, as they well note, they could not have committed so great a sacrilege, or have bin said to lye to the Holy Ghost by only reserving to themselvs some part of that which was their own, and then denying it to St. *Peter.*

As for *Chastity*, it is proved thus: *There be Eunuchs who have gelded themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven; he that can take, let him take.* Mat. 19.12. This was an actual councel of perpetual chastity; and imply's also a Vow, because it signify's that some by one act of the will had cut off from themselves all power of marrying, which could not be but by Vow, as the Fathers conclude on this place. St. *Paul* commands that young widdows should not be chosen or admitted to the vow of widdow-hood: *But the younger widdowes* (saith he) *avoyd, for when they*

shall be wanton in Christ, they will marry, having damnation, because they have made voyd their first faith, 1 *Tim.* 5. 2. (that is, their vow of chastity.) *He that hath resolved in his heart being setled, not having necessity, but having power of his own will, to keep his Virgin, doth well; therefore he that giveth his Virgin in marriage does well; and he that gives her not, does better,* 1 *Cor.* 7. 37, 38. Add to this, that the Fathers (on those words, *How can this be, because I know not man?* St. *Lu.* 1. 34.) affirm and prove that the blessed Virgin Mary had vow'd chastity; otherwise she might have known man, and have conceiv'd, and born a son without miracle.

As to *Obedience* thus: *Children, obey your Parents in all things; Colos.* 3. 20. And Christ himself was subject to the blessed Virgin and St. *Joseph* by a meer voluntary subjection; He himself being the absolute Lord of them and all things. St. *Luke* 2. 51. *Obey your Prelates and be subject to them, &c. Heb.* 13. 17.

Fathers for this Point.

In the second Age, St. *Ignatius*: *Let Virgins know to whom they have consecrated themselves. Epist. ad Antiochens.* And he commands sacred (vowed) Virgins to be honoured, *Epist. ad Tharsens.*

In

In the ſame Age *Dionyſius* tells us, *That Monkes promiſe publikely in the Church, that they renounce a diviſible or ſecular life, which is divided betwixt God and the world*, Eccleſ. Hierarch. part 2. c,6.

In the third Age *Tertullian*, *Haſt thou married to Chriſt? thou haſt delivered thy fleſh to him, thou haſt eſpouſed thy ripeneſs to him.* l. de velandis virginibus. And St. *Fulgentius*; *Whoſoever hath gelded himſelf for the Kingdom of Heaven &c. hath in his heart vow'd chaſtity to God.* l. de fide ad Petrum. c. 3.

In the ſame Age St. *Cyprian*; *Thoſe that have conſecrated themſelves to Chriſt, and bequeathed as well their minde as fleſh to God, let them conſummate their work deſtinated to a great reward.* l. de Habitu Virginum.

In the fourth Age St. *Ambroſe*; *Thou forbiddeſt Maids initiated with ſacred myſteries, and conſecrated to integrity, to marry: would to God I could recal them being about to marry.* l. de virginitate.

In the fifth Age St. *Auguſtine*: *Another vowes to leave all things, and to go into the common life and ſociety of the Saints, he hath vow'd a great vow:* in *Pſal.* 25. And in another place he tells us, *That a certain Maid did very ill in having a will to marry, becauſe ſhe had vow'd her ſelf to God*, in Pſalm 75.

The Councel of *Chalcedon* has defined; *It*

is

is not lawful that a Virgin which hath vow'd her self to God, (and the like of a Monk) *should marry; and if they shall be found doing this, let them be excommunicated*, Can. 15. Alias 16. Anno Dom. 451.

The fourth Councel of *Carthage* decreed, *That if any widdowes have vow'd themselves to our Lord, and shall afterwards pass to secular marriages, according to the Apostle they shall have damnation, because they have dared to make void their Faith, which they have vowed to our Lord, Can.* 104. *An. dom.* 439. See also the Toletan Councel, *can.* 54. *alias* 55.

Objections Solved.

Obj. Vowes are only Popish ceremonies.

Ans. They are great acts of vertue, and of divine institution, as hath been proved. All ceremonies are external, but Vowes may be internal and made by the will only.

Obj. The word *Vow* is not in all the new Scripture.

Ans. The thing is, which is equivalent.

Obj. All that we can do to Gods honour, we are already bound to do; Therfore 'tis fond to vow it.

Ans. You are fond in both your assertions. No man is bound to sell all he hath to give to the poor; To geld himself for the Kingdom of Heaven; To spend all his dayes in

prayer, faſting, and mortification, &c. yet theſe things we can do by Gods aſſiſtance, and ſome are found who perform them for his ſake.

Obj. God may exact all we can do.

Anſ. He may, but does not; he hath left us free in many things to do, or not to do them.

Obj. All that belongs to our own or our neighbours ſalvation, we are obliged to.

Anſ. All that is abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, I grant; All that is profitable to ſalvation, I deny; there is a certain latitude in goodneſſe; elſe he that is not beſt, would be worſt, which is a Paradox.

Obj. Why ſhould we oblige our ſelves to that which God himſelf hath not oblig'd us to?

Anſ. To ſhew our gratitude and piety towards him, who hath given us ſuch freedom, and done infinitly more for us then he was bound to do.

Obj. It is better to marry then burn (with unchaſt deſires or actions) 1 *Cor.*7.9.

Anſ. He ſpeaks only to ſuch as are free, and have no vow or lawful impediment to the contrary; Otherwiſe it would follow, that if ſuch as are married ſhould chance to burn with any unchaſt deſires or actions, they alſo ought to marry again, which is groſs

groſs and impious. Thus St. *Ambroſe ad Virginem lapſam*, c. 5. and St. *Hierom contra Jovinianum*, explicate this place.

Obj. That which is done without vow, is more freely done, and therfore more pleaſing to God.

Anſ. Nothing is more freely done, then what we vow to do; becauſe the Vow it ſelf is freely made; and the neceſſity which ariſeth from the Vow, is only a neceſſity of ſuppoſition, which detracts nothing from the dignity of the act, but adds to it.

Obj. No man is certain he ſhall keep ſuch Vows. Therfore it is raſh to make them.

Anſ. *If thou canſt not* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *it is becauſe thou wilt not; for God hath left both in thy arbitrement; we are certain God both can and will enable us, if we ask it as we ought. Aſk and ye ſhall have.* Wherfore I deny your conſequence.

Obj. *All do not take that word*, Matth. 19.

Anſ. He doth not ſay *all cannot*, but *all do not*, and the reaſon is, *they will not.*

Obj. St. *Paul* forewarns us of *ſome, who in the later times would forbid to marry, and teach to abſtain from meats.*

Anſ. He ſpake of the *Manichees* who held marriage to be unlawful, and all fleſh meats to be unclean; we forbid not either in due and lawful circumſtances, but hold marriage to be a holy Sacrament, and no ſort of meat

to

to be evil of it ſelf, but only at forbidden times.

Obj. The Council of *Gangers* condemnes thoſe who execrate marriage.

Anſ. So do all Catholicks; we diſlike and forbid none but ſacrilegious and unlawful marriages.

ARTICLE. XXVII.

Of the poſſibility of keeping the Commandements.

OUr Tenet is, *That a juſt man, aſſiſted by the ſpirit and grace of God, may (if he himſelf be not in fault,) and ought to keep the Precepts of the Decalogue, or ten Commandements of the Moral law:* which we prove thus.

The Firſt Argument.

1. All that which God hath commanded us, as a neceſſary condition, for our obtaining

ning ſalvation, is poſſible to us by Gods aſſiſtance.

2. But God hath commanded us as a neceſſary condition for our obtaining ſalvation, to keep the Precepts of the Decalogue or Ten Commandements of the moral Law.

3. Therfore to keep the precepts of the Decalogue or Ten Commandements is poſſible to us by Gods aſſiſtance.

The *Major* is manifeſt, becauſe otherwiſe ſalvation were impoſſible to be obtain'd, and God a Tyrant in commanding that which he himſelf cannot enable us to do.

The *Minor* is proved: *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandements*, St. Mat. 19. 17. *do this* (keep the Commandements) *and thou ſhalt live*, St. Luke 18.28. *If you love me, keep my Commandements.* St. *John* 14. 14. *He that ſhall break one of theſe leaſt Commandements and teach men ſo to do, he ſhall be called leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven.* St. Matth. 5. 20. *Not hearers of the Law are juſt with God, but doers of the Law ſhall be juſtified.* Rom. 2. 13. See *Exod.* c. 20. and 34. *Deut.* 27. 31. Where God threatens grievous puniſhments to ſuch as break them, and juſtly ſure, ſince abſolutely to break any one of them, willingly, is againſt Charity, and damnable.

A Second Argument.

1. If God have promiſed to enable men to keep his Commandements, and ſome *de facto* have kept them, then they are poſſible to be kept.

2. But God hath promiſed to enable men to keep his Commandements, and ſome *de facto* have kept them.

3. Therfore they are poſſible to be kept.

The *Major* is manifeſt, becauſe otherwiſe we make God unable to performe his promiſes, which is blaſphemy, and grant, that ſome have done impoſſibilities, which is abſurd.

The *Minor* is proved. *I will put my ſpirit in the middle of you, and I will make that you walk in my precepts, and keep my Judgments and do them.* Ezek. 36.27. *They ſhall be my people &c. they ſhall walk in my Judgments and keep my Commandements, and do them.* Ezek. 37. 24. See the promiſe. *Zachary and Elizabeth were both juſt before God, walking in all the Commandements and juſtifications of our Lord without blame.* St. Luke 1. 6. Noah *was a juſt man and perfect*, Gen. 6. 9. *Thine they were* (ſaith our Saviour) *and to me thou gaveſt them, and they have kept my word.* St. John 17. 6. *Whatſoever we ſhall ask we ſhall receive of him, becauſe*

cauſe we keep his Commandements, 1 Joh. 3.22. *I ran the way of thy Commandements when thou didſt dilate my heart*, Pſal. 118. See alſo the performance.

Fathers for this Point.

In the Second Age *Tertullian*; *No Law could impoſe on him who had not in his power due obedience to the Law:* Theſe words of his are cited by the Proteſtant Centuriſts, *Centur.* 3. *Column.* 240.

In the Third Age *Origen*: *The baptized may fulfil the Law in all things*, Homil. 9. in Joſ.

In the Fourth Age St. *Baſil. It is an impious thing to ſay that the Commandements of God are impoſſible*, Orat. in illud, Attende tibi.

In the ſame Age *St. Chryſoſtom*; *Blame not our Lord, he commands nothing impoſſible*, Homil. 8.

In the ſame Age St. *Hierom*; *We execrate their blaſphemy who affirm any thing impoſſible to be commanded by God to men. In explanat. Symbol. ad Damaſ.* and again, *We are therfore to underſtand that Chriſt commands nothing impoſſible*, Comment. in *Matth.* 5.

In the Fifth Age, St. *Auguſtine*; *God who is juſt cannot command any thing impoſſible, neither will he that is holy, damn man, for that which he cannot avoid.* Sermone. 61. de Tempore.

The

The Second Milevitan Council defined, *That whoever ſhall ſay, the grace of God doth in this only help us not to ſin, becauſe by it the underſtanding of the Commandements is revealed to us, that ſo we may know what we ought to deſire and eſchew, but that by it, it is not given us, that what we know to be done, we may love and be able to do;* c. 4. This Council was ſubſcribed by St. *Auguſtine An.* 400. and odd.

The Second Arauſican Council, defined, *We believe all ſuch as are Baptized &c. Chriſt helping and cooperating, may and ought to fulfil, if they will labour faithfully, theſe things that belong to ſalvation,* c. 25. *An. Dom.* 440. odd.

Objections Solved.

Obj. St. *Paul* calls the Law a yoak of ſervitude, ſuppoſing it impoſſible to be kept, *Gal.* 5.

Anſ. He ſpeaks of the Ceremonial Law of the *Iews*, which was abrogated by the death of Chriſt. If you will needs extend it to the moral Law, I anſwer, it is impoſſible to be kept by the bare knowledg of the Law, or ſtrength of nature only, but not by grace and aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; for *that which was impoſſible to the Law, is made poſſible by the grace of Chriſt.* Rom. 8. (viz. our fulfilling the

the justification of the Law) verſ. 3. 4.

Obj. To will is preſent with me, but to accompliſh that which is good, I find not, Rom. 7.

Anſ. He ſpeaks there of the firſt motions of concupiſcence, which are not always in our power to hinder, nor any ſin at all, if we neither delight in, nor conſent to them, which by Gods aſſiſtance is always in our power.

Obj. We have not always that aſſiſtance from God.

Anſ. 'Tis our own fault then; we may have it, if we ask it, as we ought: *Ask and ye ſhall have.*

Obj. We all offend in many things. St. James 2. *If we ſay we have no ſin, we delude our ſelves.* 1 Joan. 1. 8.

Anſ. Thoſe places concern only venial ſins, which are not abſolutly againſt charity, but only weaken it; and therfore break not the Commandements abſolutly, but only hinder our perfect obſervance of them; they are not *againſt*, (as the Fathers ſay,) but *by* or *beſides* the Commandements.

Obj. We cannot love God in this life with our whole heart as he commands.

Anſ. In that perfection as the Bleſſed do in heaven, or ſo as to love nothing elſe but him I grant; comparatively and ſo as to prefer him before all other goods, I deny; and this

is all that is intended by ſuch expreſſions. So *Ioſhua follow'd God in all his heart*, 4. Kin. 13. *He accompliſhed all things, and omitted not one word of all the Commandements which our Lord gave to Moſes.* Ioſh. 2.

Obj. Paul ſaid, *The law is not put for the juſt, but for ſinners.* Therfore the juſt are not bound to keep it.

Anſ. It is not put for the juſt, according to the coercive power of it, becauſe they keep it willingly, but for ſinners, I grant; according to its directive power, I deny it, and your conſequence.

Obj. St. *Peter* calls the Law *a yoak, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear.* Acts 1. 15.

Anſ. He ſpeaks there only of the penal ceremonies, not the moral precepts of the Law. He was not ignorant what his great Maſter had ſaid: *My yoak is ſweet, my burthen light*, St. Matth. 11. 30.

ARTIC.

ARTICLE. XXVIII.

Of the Sacraments.

OUr Tenet is, *That the Sacraments of the new Law, ordained by Christ our Lord, for our Justification, are in number Seaven*; Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreame Unction, Holy Order, *and* Matrimony, *and that they all confer grace instrumentally, if we our selves put no impediments*; Proved thus.

The Argument.

If the Sacram! of the Lords Supper be a visible signe of then it is not the Invisible grace or natural Body of Christ. For,

Signū et Signatū non sunt idem.

1. A Sacrament is defined by the Church, *To be a visible* (or sensible) *sign of invisible grace, divinely instituted by Christ our Lord, for our Sanctification.*

2. But in the new Law there be seaven Visible signes of invisible grace divinely instituted by Christ our Lord for our sanctification.

3. There-

3. Therfore in the new Law there be ſeaven Sacraments.

1. The *Minor* (which only needs proof) is proved: for Baptiſm; *Go ye teaching all Nations and Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt*, St. Matth. 28. 19.

2. For Confirmation; *And he that confirmeth us with you in Chriſt, and hath annoiled us, God, who alſo hath ſealed us, and given the pledge of the ſpirit in our hearts*, 2 Cor. 1. 22. And when *Philip* the Deacon had converted *Samaria* to the Faith, *Peter* and *John* were ſent to confirm them, *Who, when they were come* (ſaith the Text) *prayed for them, that they might receive the holy Ghoſt, &c. Then did they impoſe their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghoſt*, Acts 8. 14, 15, 16.

3. For the Bleſſed Euchariſt, *He took bread &c. ſaying, This is my Body, This is my Blood, &c.* St. Matth. 26. 26, 27. St. Mark 14. St. Luke 22.

4. For Penance, *Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt; whoſe ſins ye ſhall forgive they are forgiven, and whoſe ſins ye ſhall retaine, they are retain'd*, St. John 20. 23.

5. For extream Unction, *Is any man ſick among you? let him bring in the Prieſts of the Church, and let them pray over him annoyling him with oyle, in the name of our Lord; and the*

prayer of Faith ſhall ſave the ſick man, and our Lord will lift him up: and if he be in ſins, his ſins ſhall be forgiven him: St. James 5. 13, 14, 15.

6. For the Holy Order, *Do ye this for a commemoration of me*; St. Luke 22. 19, 20. There he made his Apoſtles Prieſts, by giving them power to offer ſacrifices, which is the higheſt act of Prieſthood. *Neglect not the grace which is in thee by propheſy, with the impoſition of the hands of the Prieſthood*, 1 Tim. 4. 14.

7. For Matrimony, *Therfore they are not two but one fleſh: that therfore which God hath joyn'd let not man ſeparate*, St. Matth. 19. 6. *There ſhall be two in one fleſh: this is a great Sacrament, but I ſay in Chriſt and the Church*, Epheſ. 5. 31, 32.

See here the number and divine inſtitution teſtify'd.

The viſible ſign in *Baptiſm* is natural water, and the words; the inviſible grace, the ſanctity and juſtice given to him that is Baptiz'd. *He that ſhall believe and ſhall be Baptiz'd, ſhall be ſaved*, St. Matth. 28. 19. *But ye are waſhed, but ye are juſtified, but ye are ſanctified, &c.* 1 Cor. 6. 10.

The viſible ſigne in Confirmation is Oyle bleſſed by a Biſhop, mingled with Balm, and the words of the form. The inviſible grace, the holy Ghoſt, or ſpeciall grace to profeſs the

the faith of Chriſt thereupon: *And they received the Holy Ghoſt.* Acts 8.16.

The viſible ſign in the *Euchariſt*, is the outward forms or accidents of bread. The inviſible grace, Chriſt himſelf, the fountain of all grace: *This is my body, &c.* St. Matth. 26. *He that eateth of this bread, ſhall live for ever*; St. John 6.

The viſible ſign in *Penance*, is the Penitent confeſſing his ſins, and the Prieſt abſolving. The inviſible grace, the remiſſion of his ſins made by grace. *Whoſe ſins ye ſhall remit, they are remitted*, St. John 20.

The viſible ſigne in *Extream Unction*, is the prayer of the Prieſt (*By that annointing, and his own moſt pious mercy, Let our Lord pardon thee, &c.*) and holy Oyle with which he is annointed. The inviſible grace, the remiſſion of the reliques of ſin, *His ſins ſhall be forgiven him*, St. James 5.

The Viſible ſign in *Holy Order*, are; the things given to him that is Ordained, and the words of the Biſhop, *Receive power, &c.* The Inviſible grace, the grace that is there given him: *Neglect not the grace which is in thee, &c.* 1 Tim. 4.14.

The Viſible ſigne in *Matrimony*, are the words or ſigns of the parties by which they expreſſe mutual and preſent conſent: The Inviſible grace, a ſupernaturall conjunction

by Almighty God, and grace given them in order to the holy procreation and education of children in the knowledge, love, and feare of God: which cannot be done without ſpeciall grace; *What God hath joyned, &c.* St. Matth. 19.

That *Baptiſme* is neceſſary for thoſe that are at yeares of underſtanding, by the neceſſity of a divine precept, I take for granted by our adverſaries, and therefore ſhall not need to prove farther then hath been done already by the words of Inſtitution.

For the neceſſity of Infant-baptiſme, I take this enſuing probation.

A ſecond Argument.

1 All that which Chriſt hath ordained as a neceſſary means of ſalvation, as well for Infants, as thoſe of riper age.

2 But Chriſt hath ordained *Baptiſme* as a neceſſary means of ſalvation.

Therefore Baptiſm is neceſſary is neceſſary as well for Infants, as thoſe of riper age.

The *Major* is manifeſt; becauſe without a means of abſolute neceſſity, *that* whereto it is a means, cannot be had.

The *Minor* is proved: *Unleſs a man be born again of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*, St. John 3.5. (He exempts not the Infants of one day.) *Do penance,*

and

and be every one of you baptized in the name of our Lord Ieſus Chriſt, for the remiſſion of your ſins, Acts 2.38. *He hath ſaved us by the laver of regeneration,* Titus 3. 26. (He excepts none.)

Fathers for this point.

In the ſecond Age, St. Dionyſius *affirms it to be a Tradition from the Apoſtles, That Infants ſhould be baptized,* Lib. eccleſ. Hierar. c. ultimo. part. ult.

In the ſame age, *Ireneus, That all are ſaved who are regenerated in Chriſt, Infants, Children, youths, and old men,* l. 2. c. 39.

In the third age Origen: *The Church hath received a Tradition from the Apoſtles, to give Baptiſme alſo to little ones:* l. 5. in c. 6. ad Rom.

In the ſame age St. Cyprian: *It ſeemed good not onely to him, but the whole Council, that little ones ſhould be baptized, even before the eighth day:* l. 3. epiſt. ad Fidum.

St. Clement alſo in the ſecond age: *Becauſe the frailty of our former nativity, which is made yours by man, is cut off to one regenerate of water, and born to God, and ſo at laſt you come to ſalvation, otherwiſe it is impoſſible,* Epiſt. 4.

In the fourth age St. Epiphanius *condemns* Cerinthus *of Hereſie, for teaching a man may be ſaved without baptiſm,* Hereſ. 28.

In the fifth age St. Auguſtine: *If thou wilt be a Catholike, believe not, teach not, ſay not, that*

Infants

Infants, prevented with death before they are baptized can come to the pardon of their Originall ſins: l. 3. de origine animar. c. 9. And again, *Whoſoever ſhall ſay that little ones ſhall be quickned in Chriſt, who depart out of this life without partaking of this Sacrament; this man truly both contradicts the preaching of the Apoſtles, and condemns the whole Church: where they therefore haſte, and run with little ones to be baptized, becauſe they believe without doubt, that otherwiſe, they cannot be quickned at all in Chriſt*: Epiſt. 28. ad Hieron.

The firſt Nicen- Councell decreed, *That whoever is baptized, deſcends guilty of ſins, &c. and aſcends free from his ſins, made the ſon of God, and heire of his grace, coheire alſo of Chriſt, having put upon him Chriſt himſelfe, as it is written, &c.* l. 3. decret. de Sancto Baptiſmate.

The ſecond Milevitan Councell defined, that, *Whoever denies children newly born to be baptized, or ſays, &c. they contract nothing of originall ſin from Adam which may be cleanſed with the laver of regeneration, &c.* Anathema, c. 2. Age the 5.

Objections Solved.

Obj. Our Lord ſaid to *Abraham*, *I am thy God, and of thy ſeed*, Gen. 17. 7. Therfore we are

are made the children of God by being born of believing parents.

Anſ. That promiſe concerns literally peculiar protection, and worldly felicity, not the remiſſion of ſins and everlaſting life; neither can we be the ſonnes of *Abraham* by carnall generation, or by our carnall parents, (we are not Jews but Gentiles) but onely by ſpirituall generation (to wit, baptiſme) by which we are born to God, and made the brothers of Chriſt, the ſon of Abraham. *Thoſe* (ſaith St. Paul) *are the ſons of Abraham, not who are the ſons of the fleſh, but of faith*, Rom. 4. 12,13 ſo that your conſequence is ill deduc'd.

Obj. The man an Infidel is ſanctified by the faithfull woman, and the woman an Infidel ſanctified by the faithfull husband: otherwiſe your children ſhould be unclean, but now they are holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14.

Anſ. If this text could prove any thing to your purpoſe, it would alſo prove the Infidel wife and Infidel husband in that caſe might be ſanctified and ſaved without either baptiſme or faith, as well as their children, which no man yet ever held; but let St. *Auguſtine* anſwer you, *It is to be held without doubting, whatſoever that ſanctification was, it was not of power to make Chriſtians, and remit ſins, unleſs they were made faithfull by Eccleſiaſticall*

sticall sanctification, and Sacrament. Neither can little ones (how just or holy so ever their parents were) be absolved from the guilt of Original sin, unlesse they shall be baptized in Christ. &c. whence it comes that none can be regenerated in their parents, not being born; but if he shall be born, it is meet he be regenerated, because unless one be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God, l. 3. de peccat. merit. & remiss. c. 12.

Obj. Christ himselfe was not baptized till thirty years of age.

Ans. He was not conceived or born in Originall sin as we are, and therefore needed it not at all; nor was there any danger of his death, as there is of ours; so that his priviledge cannot be our president.

Obj. The Scripture in many places says, they must be taught before they be baptized, *Goe ye teach all Nations, baptizing them.* Therefore Infants which cannot be taught, ought not to be baptized.

Ans. Those who are at years of understanding, must be taught and instructed first I grant; Infants I deny. Yet they must also be baptized, as hath been proved.

Obj. The place objected concerns all Nations.

Ans. True; but not all particular persons, for the point of teaching, (Infants are excepted

ted) although it doe for the command of baptizing.

Obj. If baptiſme were neceſſary for all to ſalvation, many thouſand Infants would be damned without any ſin, which is unjuſt.

Anſ. Without any actuall ſin, I grant; without Originall, I deny; for *In Adam all die*, 1 Cor. 15. 22. *And all are born the children of wrath*, enough to juſtifie their condemnation.

Obj. You hold that ſome are ſaved without actuall baptiſme.

Anſ. Yes, by the deſire of it we doe: but Infants are not capable of that; ſo that there is no means of ſaving them in caſe they die, but actuall Baptiſme, or martyrdome for Chriſt.

Obj. Without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, Heb. 2. and conſequently to be ſaved. But Infants cannot have faith, for *how ſhal they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* Ro. 10.

Anſ. They cannot have actual faith, I grant; neither is that requiſite in them, though it be in the ripe of age; becauſe as they died in *Adam*, and ſinned onely by anothers will; ſo it is but juſt they ſhould be repaired and quickned by anothers faith, to wit, the Churches; it ſufficeth to their juſtification, that the holy Ghoſt is given them, and his ſupernaturall gifts be infuſed into them,

them, by vertue of the Sacrament.

Fathers for confirmation.

In the Second Age St. Clement: *All muſt make haſt without delay to be regenerated to God, and at length to be conſigned* (confirmed) *by a Biſhop; that is to receive the ſevenfold grace of the Holy Ghoſt, &c. becauſe otherwiſe he that is baptized cannot be a perfect Chriſtian, &c. which we have received from bleſſed Peter, and all the reſt of the Apoſtles have taught, our Lord commanding*: in epiſt. ad Julium.

In the ſame Age, Dionyſius: *But the conſummating, annoynting of Oyntment, gives alſo the comming of the Holy Ghoſt to them that are conſecrated with the moſt ſacred myſterie of regeneration*: Eccleſ. Hierach. c. 4. part. 3.

In the Third Age *Origen*, (ſpeaking of ſuch as were already baptized) ſays, *But the gift of the grace of the Spirit, is deſigned by the Image* (or ſign) *of Oyle*. Homil. 8. in Levit. prope finem.

In the ſame Age *Cyprian*; *It is neceſſary that he be Annoynted who hath been baptized, that Chriſme being received, he may be the Annointed of God, and have Chriſt in him*: Epiſt. ult.

In the ſame Age Tertullian, *The fleſh is Annointed, that the ſoule may be conſecrated, the fleſh is overſhadowed with the Impoſition of hands, that*

that the ſoule may be illuminated with the ſpirit: l. de reſurrect. carnis.

In the ſame Age, Clemens Alexandrinus: *He that illuminated him with the Sacrament of Baptiſme, hath afterwards ſigned him with the ſeale of our Lord, as with the perfect and ſafe cuſtody of his ſoule:* apud Euſeb. l. 3. c. 17. in Ruffino. 23.

In the fourth Age St. *Ambroſe, The ſacred ſeale follows, becauſe it follows after the Font, that perfection may be made, when at the invocation of the Prieſt* (a Biſhop) *the Holy Ghoſt is infuſed:* l. 3. de Sacramentis, c. 2.

In the fifth Age St. *Auguſtine: In this Oyntment Petillian will have the Sacrament of Chriſom to be underſtood, which truly in the kind of viſible ſeales is holy, as Baptiſm it ſelfe:* l. 2. cont. litt. Petill. c. 104.

The Eliberine Council decreed, *If he ſhall ſurvive,* (to wit, after Baptiſm) *let him bring him to the Biſhop, that he may be perfected by the Impoſition of hands:* can. 38. Age the fourth, about the time of the firſt Nicen Council.

The Councill of Laodicea decreed, *That thoſe that have been baptized, muſt after Baptiſme retain the moſt Holy Chriſom, and be made partakers of the Heavenly kingdom:* c. 48.

Ob-

Objections Solved.

Obj. Paul recalls us from the *Elements of this world*, Col. 2. 8.

Answ. From naked elements which cannot justifie (such as were the Sacraments of the old law) I grant; from sanctifying and quickning elements, such as these are, I deny. He sends us to these, as you have heard.

Obj. Your form of Chrisom, or Confirmation is not in the Scripture.

Ans. Neither is the expresse form of Baptism there: it is in Apostolicall Tradition, which sufficeth.

Touching the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, I take that also for granted by our Adversaries, and have already said enough above.

Fathers for Penance.

In the second Age Tertullian, *God foreseeing the poyson*, (to wit of sin) *the gate of pardon being fast, and the bolt of washing being shut, hath yet permitted something to lie open, and hath placed in the porch the second Penance, which may open to them that knock:* l. de penitent. And again, *Let him blot out what hath been committed by doing Penance, by weeping,*

ping, *by ſatisfying*, &c. Homil. 6. in Exod.

In the third Age St. Cyprian affirms, That *private Confeſſion, in which men confeſſed their ſins and wicked thoughts (not only mortall, but veniall) and had ſatisfaction impoſed according to the offence, was uſuall in his time, and earneſtly exhorts all thereunto:* Sermone 5. de lapſis.

In the fourth Age, St. Hierom: *Let it be redeemed by the blood of our Saviour, either in the gift of Baptiſme, or Penance, which imitates the grace of Baptiſm.*

In the ſame Age St. Chryſoſtome: *They not only regenerate us* (by Baptiſm) *but afterwards have power to pardon us our ſins:* l. 3. de Sacerdot.

In the ſame Age St. Ambroſe: *Why doe ye Baptize, if ſins cannot be remitted by a man? for in Baptiſm is the remiſſion of all ſins; nor is it materiall, whether Prieſts challenge to themſelves this power by Penance, or by Baptiſm; for it is the ſame in both:* l. de pœnitent. c. 7.

In the fifth Age St. Auguſtin ſays, *Some run unto the Church asking Baptiſm; others, Reconciliation; others alſo, the doing of Penance it ſelfe: all, the conferring and making of Sacraments;* Epiſt. 108. And again, *If murther be committed by a Catechumen, it is waſhed away by Baptiſme: if by one that is baptized, it needs Penance and Reconciliation,* de adulter. conjug. l. 2. c. 16.

The

The third Councell of Carthage decreed, That *the time of Penance ſhould be appointed Penitents by the arbiterment of the Biſhop according to the difference of their ſins:* can. 31. 1200. yeers agoe.

The Cabilon Council affirms, *That their Confeſſion being made, Penance be enjoyned to the penitents by Prieſts, all Prieſts agree:* can. 8. above 1000. yeers ſince.

Objections Solved.

Obj. There is no Element in Penance; therfore no Sacrament.

Anſ. I deny the conſequence: there is a viſible ſign, which is ſufficient.

Obj. Chriſt and St. *John* in all their preaching penance, make no mention of a Sacrament of Penance.

Anſ. True; it was not inſtituted till after the Reſurrection. *Jo.* 20.

Fathers for Extream Unction.

In the third Age Origen ſays, That *Prieſts ought to doe at all times what James preſcribeth ſaying, Is any ſick amongſt you, &c.* Homil. 2. in Levit.

In the fourth Age St. Chryſoſtome aſſerts, The *Obligation of Prieſts to keep the precepts of* St. James:

St. James: *Is any man ſicke, &c.* l. 3. de Sacerdot.

In the fifth Age St. Auguſtine *exhorts the ſick to be mindfull, and keep the ſaid precept of the Apoſtle:* Serm. 215. de tempore.

The firſt Nicen Council *mentions the Oyle of the ſick, and diſtinguiſhes it from Chriſom, or Oyle of Confirmation, and the Oyle of Catechumens,* c. 60. ex. Arab.

The Second Cabilon Council decreed, That *according to the documents of the bleſſed James the Apoſtle, to whom the decrees of the Fathers are conſonant, the ſick ought to be anoynted by the Prieſt with Oyle, bleſſed by a Biſhop: therefore ſuch a medicine is much to be regarded which heales the langnors both of ſoul and body:* can. 48.

Objections ſolved.

Obj. St. *Iames* ſpeaks only of corporall diſeaſes, and the miraculous gife of cures.

Anſ. He would not then have bid them call in Prieſts onely, but ſuch as had the gift of cures, which were not alwaies Prieſts; nor was that onely done by annoynting, much leſſe would he have added, *And if he be in ſins, his ſins ſhall be forgiven him.*

Fathers

Fathers for Holy Order.

In the ſecond Age Dionyſius affirms, That *by order grace is given to him that is ordained.* 5. Eccleſ. Hierarch. de ritu Ordinan.

In the third Age St. Cyprian, *De Operibus Cardinalibus.*

In the fourth Age St. Ambroſe, *Man impoſeth his hand, but God conferreth the grace:* l. de dignitat. Sacerdot. c. 5.

In the ſame Age St. Chryſoſtom, *Prieſthood is finiſhed on earth, but ought to be referred into the number and order of celeſtiall things*: de Sacerd.

In the fifth Age St. Auguſtine: *Let them explicate how the Sacrament of the Baptized cannot be loſt, and the Sacrament of one ordained can.* 2 cont. Parmen. 13. and l. 3. de baptiſm. c. 1.

In the ſame Age Theodoret teaches, That *the grace of the Holy Ghoſt is given by Ordination*: in 1 Tim. 5.

The Council of Florence hath defined it to be a Sacrament, as you have ſeen above.

Fathers for Matrimony.

In the ſecond Age Ireneus: *Where, by all meanes they ought to meditate on the myſterie* (it is the Greek word for a Sacrament) *of marriage,* l. 1. c. 1.

In

In the third Age St. Cyril teaches, *That Christ ſanctified Wedlock, and gave grace to Marriages*, 2 in Joan. 22.

In the fourth Age, St. Ambroſe, *He ſignifies that there is a great Sacrament of myſterie in the unity of man and woman.* In c. 5. ad Epheſ. v. 32.

In the fifth Age, St. Auguſtine, *They ſhall be two in one fleſh; this is a great Sacrament: That which in Chriſt and the Church is a great Sacrament; this in all men and wives whatſoever is the leaſt Sacrament; but notwithſtanding an inſeparable Sacrament of conjunction.* Tract. 9. in Joan. And again, *In the Church not only the bond, but alſo the Sacrament of marriage is commended.* l. de fide & operib. c. 7. And in the third place, *In the marriage of our women the ſanctity of the Sacrament is more worth then the fruitfulneſs of the womb.* l. de bono conjugii. c. 18. 24.

The Council of Florence defines: *There be ſeven Sacraments, Baptiſm, &c. and they all give grace to the worthy receivers, &c. Litera Unionis in decret. Eugen.* It was ſubſcribed both by the Greek and Latin Church.

Objections ſolved.

Obj. A Sacrament cannot be given to ſuch as are abſent; but Matrimony may: Therefore Matrimony is no Sacrament.

Anſ. I diſtinguiſh your *major*; a Sacrament cannot be given to ſuch as are abſent, if they be ſo abſent, as not preſent by proxy, I grant it; if they be preſent by proxy, though Phyſically abſent, I deny it. I diſtinguiſh the *minor* after the ſame manner; and ſo deny the conſequence.

Object. Matrimony hath no determinate form.

Anſ. Yes, it hath; It is determined to words or ſignes expreſſing mutuall and preſent conſent, though not confined to any preciſe number of words or ſyllables.

Obj. The materiall uſe of the bed, is too mean a thing to deſerve a Sacrament.

Anſw. It is not, it makes them two in one fleſh, and renders marriage indiſſoluble; nor is the education of their children in the ſervice of God, the mutuall fidelity, peace and comfort of the parties any mean thing. All which depend upon this Sacrament.

The

The Concluſion.

HOw can I better cloſe this little *Manuel*, then with a ſhort *Apoſtrophe* to our poor Country, by crying out unto her with the Prophet, *O Captive daughter of Sion, looſe the Bonds off thy own neck* &c. Iſa. 52. ſhake off the Fetters of the ſervitude; I mean the ſervitude of Schiſm and hereſie: That Monſter, Schiſm, which firſt, through the inſatiable luxury of an effeminate tyrant, broke the bonds of unity and obedience in Gods Church, and has ſince (according to its proper quality) hatch'd an innumerable brood of Sects and Hereſies, which yet are daily ingendring more, and continually wander up and down in ſtrange unknown paths, and can never finde repoſe or ſettlement, whilſt they are out of Gods holy Arke, the *Catholique Church*; which alone has ſtood conſtant and immoveable amidſt all thoſe changes and revolutions theſe late unhappy yeers have produced: which alone yeelds true comfort and aſſurance to thoſe that rely on her Authority.

Return then (my dear Countrey) to thy own

own true mother, and embrace the liberty of her saving Faith. This is the freedom I invite thee to: This is the happinesse I wish thee: This is the way I have chalk'd thee out by the strait line of Apostolical Doctrines, a milky way, which leads soules to eternal beatitude. God of his mercy grant thou maist walk in it, through Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour, to whom be all honour and glory for ever. *Amen.*

Appendix

AN APPENDIX TO THE Article concerning the Popes Supremacy.

Pag. 90.

AFter I had finiſhed this *Treatiſe*, a learned friend ſent me a certain Britiſh teſtimony, taken out of Sir *Hen. Spelman*, *de Concil. p.* 168. and out of it an Argument framed againſt the Popes power over the whole flock of Chriſt: and though it came not to my hands ſoon enough to be admitted to its proper place, yet I thought good rather to adde it here, then not at all, leſt as it has deluded ſome, it might ſeduce others, if not called to a juſt trial.

Sir *Henry* ſayes, he findes the Original Cambrian interlined with Engliſh in an old Manuſcript of *Peter Moſton*, a Cambrian Gentleman; copied ſo (if we may truſt Sir *Hen-*

ries conjecture) out of another of more antiquity: and, to fit it for other Nations, himself translates it into *Latin*, the English and Welsh remaining verbatim transcribed out of Mr. *Moſtons* pretended Copy; and ſo prints it in his book. When, and by whom that Manuſcript was compoſed, he profeſſes himſelf ignorant: but ſets down the teſtimony as the Abbot of *Bangor's* Anſwer to St. *Auguſtin* the Monk, when he demanded of the Britans an acknowledgement of ſubmiſſion to the Roman Church: And affirms that this Abbot & firſt Author of the Cambrian lines was the learned and renowned *Dinoth* or *Dionoth*; one of thoſe, that, with the ſeven Britan Biſhops, gave meeting to St. *Auguſtine* in the ſecond Synod held at *Worceſter*, as ſome will have it, in the yeare of Chriſt 601. the firſt meeting (of fewer and meaner perſons) having been (as far as I can gueſſe by Hiſtory) not about *Worceſter*, as Sir *Henry* puts it, but in the confines of the *Vectians* (the Iſle of *Wight*) and *Weſt-ſaxons*.

That all may better diſcern the vanity of this objection, I will here ſet down the Teſtimony, whence it's taken, word for word, and point for point, juſt as it lies printed in Sir *Henries* book, in the original Cambrian (which is chiefly or only to be regarded) and as tis tranſlated into Engliſh and Latin, thus,

Bid ispis a diogel i chwi yn, bod ni holl nn ac aral, yn

Be it known and without doubt unto you, that we all are, and every one of us

Notum sit & absque dubitatione vobis, quod nos omnes sumus & quilibet nostrum

ubidd ac ynn ostingedig i eglwys duw, ac ir Paab, o Rubain,

obedient and subjects to the Church of God, and to the Pope of Rome,

obedientes & subditi Ecclesiæ Dei, & Papæ Romæ,

ac i boob Kyar Grissdion dwyuol, y garu pawb yn i radd

and to every godly Christian to love every one in his degree,

& unicuique vero & pio Christiano ad amandum unumquemque in suo gradu

mewn Kariad parfaich, ac i helpio pawb o honaunt, ar air a

in perfect charity, and to help every one of them, by word and

in perfecta charitate, & ad juvandum unumquemque eorum verbo &

guecthred i bod ynn blant y Duw: ac amgenach ubyddod na hwn

deed to be the children of God: and other obedience then this

facto fore filios Dei: & aliam obedientiam quam istam

nidadwen i bod, ir neb yr yddeck chwi y henwi yn Paab, ne in

I doe not know due, to him whom you name to be Pope, nor to be the

non scio debitam, ei quem vos nominatis esse Papam, nec esse

Daad o Daad: yw gleimio ac yw ouunn, ar ubiddod hiun idden

father of fathers: to be claimed and to be demanded, and this obedience we are

patrem patrum: vindicari & postulari, & istam obedientiam nos sumus

ni yn barod yw rodde ac yw dalu iddo ef ac i pob Kristdion

ready to give and to pay to him and to every Christian

parati dare & solvere ei & cuique Christiano

yn dragwiddol. Hebid yr ydym ni dan Lywodrath escob

continually. Besides we are under the government of the Bishop

continuo. Præterea nos sumus sub gubernatione Episcopi

Kaerllion ar wysc, yr hien y sidd yn oligwr dan Duw arnom.

of Kaerleon upon Uske, who is to oversee under God over

Caerlegionis super Osca, qui est ad supervidendum sub Deo super

ni, y wuenthud i ni gadwr Fordd ys brydol.

us, to cause us to keep the way spiritual.

Nobis,

nobis, ad faciendum nos ſervare viam ſpiritualem.

Though this Record be much inſiſted on by Sir *Henry* and others, more modern oppoſers of the Roman Church, Dr. *Hammond* in his Treatiſe of *Schiſme*, p. 112. and Dr. *Bramhal*, Biſhop of *Derry*, as an argument lately found of great force, if not demonſtrative againſt that power over the whole Church of Chriſt, which all Catholiks acknowledge the Popes right, by Chriſts inſtitution: yet how unapt it is for that purpoſe, how unworthily alleaged by perſons of any ordinary judgement or erudition; and how eaſily convicted to be a ſimple impoſture, is cleerly demonſtrated by what follows.

Firſt, there is not the leaſt ſcrap of Antiquity ſo much as pretended to prove, that the Cambrian lines cited were the Abbot of *Bangors* anſwer to St. *Auguſtine* upon the occaſion ſpecified; nor that the renowned *Dinoth* was that Abbot; nor that the old Manuſcript, whence *Sir Henry* extracts the Teſtimony, was copied out of any other more ancient: All theſe are but *Sir Henries* bare conjectures, without any proof at all. And certainly, if his Manuſcript be no elder then the enterlined Engliſh, he hath groſly wronged himſelfe and his Reader, by honouring it with the ſtile of ancient: For, as every one

ſees

ſees, the Engliſh is purely modern, & cannot be ſo old by many years as *Henry* the eighths caſhiering the Popes authority, and arrogating the ſupremacy in Eccleſiaſtical matters to himſelfe; for maintenance whereof it is alleaged, and was certainly forged.

Secondly, the Welſh lines are ſo un-Cambrian for Orthography, ſo mixed with Engliſh words, and ſo juſt to the mode of the preſent Engliſh or other ſtrangers, writing imperfectly, as they are apt to ſpeak, when they are but young ſmatterers in that language, as every one but of indifferent skil therein can teſtifie; that it cannot be in the leaſt degree credible, either *Dimoth* or any other Abbot of *Bangor* ſhould be author of them.

The imperfection I point at, is (among other inſtances) apparent, Firſt, in the ordinary uſe of *V* conſonant inſtead of the Cambrian *F*, (though rightly uſed in one place) which is the ordinary errour of the preſent Engliſh or other ſtrangers, when without skil they begin to write Welſh after the ſpelling of their own language: The like errour is committed in writing *v* conſonant for *w*, in the word *guecthred*, and for *b* in the word *varod*.

Secondly, by the uſe of the letter *k* as in *Kiar Kariad. Kaerllion, Kriſdion*, and by terminating the word *Yddeck* by *ck*, all perſons indifferently skild in the language knowing

that

that the letter *k* is not in the Cambrian Alphabet; the letter *C* bearing the ſound of *K* before all vowels in Cambrian words; and that the termination of words in *ck* is an Angliciſme, not admitted in the Britiſh Language.

Thirdly, by inconſtancy in ſpelling the ſame word; as *griſſdion* in one place and *kriſdion* in another, and neither of them right; *yn* in one place, and *ynn*, in others; *hwn*, in one place, *hivn* in another, and *hiew* in a third, all for the ſame word *hwn*: *idden*, in one place, and *ydim* in another; *boob*, in one place, and *pob* in another; *uvyddod* for *vfuddod*: the word *duw* every where written for *dhuw*, which *duw* in thoſe places is juſt as Engliſhmen or other ſtrangers, not acquainted with the *Euphonia*'s of the Cambrian, are wont to write according to their ungenuine pronunciation of the language.

Fourthly, by the uſe of theſe two words, *helpio* and *gleimio*; which (though now often uſed by the Welſh, eſpecially borderers, whoſe language is more mixed with the neighbour Engliſh, yet) are known to be no Cambrian, but words of the preſent uſe among the Engliſh: *helpio* (or more uſually *helpu*) being but the Engliſh verb *help*, brought into a Cambrian termination; and *gleimio*, taken after the ſame manner from the Engliſh *clym*; as

that

that formerly from the French *clamer*, and therefore moſt probably never known even among the Engliſh, til the laws and language of the Norman Conquerour came to be mingled with theirs.

The Cambrian teſtimony being thus looked into, it cannot be more credibly thought, that *Dinoth*, or any ancient Abbot of *Bangor* was the author of it, then it can be imagined that one, renowned for learning, and celebrated for an ancient writer (as *Dinoth* was) or one of ſpecial note above others for erudition (ſuch ſurely was the Abbot of *Bangor*) ſhould (1050 years ſince, when the language was pure, and the Britans commerce with the Saxons little, unleſſe it were to warre) in writing his native ancient language (which was the ſole idiom of his Countrey) uſe modern Engliſh words; or characters, which not his own, but the Engliſh Alphabet admitted; or be inconſtant or diverſe in writing the ſame word; or fal juſt into ſuch errors of Orthography, as the Engliſh or other unskilful commonly doe at this day, when they write Cambrian: And whether this be not extreamly incredible and unlikely, I appeale to all rational judgements.

But though all theſe exceptions, obſervable only by the Britans, ſhould be winked at, and the teſtimony only conſidered in its Engliſh

English and Latine tranſlation; yet is the Author thereof eaſily convicted to be an ignorant Impoſtor by his putting *Bangor* ſix or ſeven yeers after St. *Auguſtines* comming into *England*, under the government of the Biſhop of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*. For, beſides *Bangors* being very neer to if not in the Dioceſſe of *Llan Elwy* (in antiquity *Epiſcopus Eluienſis*, as may be ſeen in Sir *Henry Spelman*, p. 106. ſpeaking of his comming to meet St. *Auguſtine* at the ſecond Synod, and now commonly called St. *Aſaph*) all hiſtories teſtifie, that the Archiepiſcopal ſeat was removed or tranſlated from *Caerlion* upon *Uske*, to *Meneuy*, in King *Artburs* time, by St. *David*; who (by Dr. *Pits*, *de Illuſt. Britan. Script. de St. Davide*) died about the yeer of Chriſt 544. which was fifty yeers before St. *Auguſtines* firſt entrance into *Britain*: whereto Sir *Henry* himſelfe aſſents, putting that tranſlation betwixt 70 and 80 years before St. *Auguſtines* comming.

Was he not then an ignorant Impoſtor that put *Bangor* ſix or ſeven yeers after St. *Auguſtines* comming, under the Biſhop of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*? Is it likely, or poſſible that *Dinoth* (or any other Abbot of *Bangor* at that time) ſhould be ignorant of the aforeſaid tranſlation, or not know under what immediate Biſhop or Metropolitan their famous

Monaſtery

Monaſtery was ſeated? *Dinoth*, I ſay, of all others, who is famous in the Catalogue of ancient Writers, (as for other Treatiſes, ſo particularly) for his defence of the juriſdiction of the Sea of *Menevy*.

To ſay with Sir *Henry*, that the Archbiſhop of *Menevy*, even after the tranſlation, retained the title of *Caerleon*, is not worth regard. Firſt, becauſe it is but his word, without proof. Secondly, becauſe it implies a contradiction, to ſay, the Sea was tranſlated, and the former title ſtil retained; Tranſlation importing, not a joynt poſſeſſion of two titles, but the taking a new, and a deſertion of the old.

To all my former exceptions againſt the Teſtimony, adde, Firſt, that there is no likelihood *Dinoth*, a writer of *Latin* books, or any other, that could either write *Latin* himſelfe, or get a Latin Secretary to help him, ſhould return a Welſh anſwer to St. *Auguſtine*, who (as all know) was an Italian, not many yeers before come from *Rome*, and cannot reaſonably be preſumed either to have underſtood the Britans native language, or to have made his demand to them otherwiſe then in *Latin*.

Secondly, that both the Engliſh, *nor to be father of fathers: to be claimed, &c.* and the Latin, *nec eſſe patrem patrum: vindicari, &c.* are

are falſe tranſlations of the Cambrian: the true being, whom you name Pope, or *father of fathers*, &c. *quem vos nominatis Papam, vel patrem patrum, &c.* Nor is the Cambrian rightly tranſlated by Sir *Henries* paſſive *vindicari*; or Dr. *Hammonds vendicari & poſtulari*; but by the active *vendicare & poſtulare*, *to claim* and *to demand*. This legerdemain diſcovers the Reformers humour, to be ſtil corrupting what fals into their hands to help out their cauſe againſt the Roman Church: and an ill cauſe it muſt be, that needs ſuch ſhifts.

Thirdly, that (however it goes with the Cambrian) there is no good ſence either in the Engliſh, *Nor to be the father of fathers, to be claimed, &c.* or in Sir *Henries* Latine, *nec eſſe patrem patrum: vindicari, &c.* as every Reader may ſee. And this Dr. *Hammond*, if affected to ſincerity, ſhould rather have acknowledged, then uſe ſo much paraphraſtical liberty and addition of his own, to make a falſ tranſlation and ſenſleſſe words ſpeak his mind againſt the Pope.

Fourthly, that the *Teſtimony* makes as much againſt the aym of the Proteſtant Prelatick Reformers, I mean the late *Kings ſupremacy*, which Dr. *Hammond* and others (to keep off the guilt of ſchiſm from themſelves) labour to ſupport, as againſt the Popes: for

thoſe words, *who is to overſee under God over us*, make the Biſhop of *Caerleon* next to God over *Bangor*, and exclude the *King* as wel as the Pope.

Fifthly, if Sir *Henry* and thoſe others that borrow out of him had been willing to ſee the truth themſelves, and communicate it faithfully to others; they would not have made reflections upon that upſtart *Teſtimony*, which appeared not til within theſe fifteen yeers, and then onely brought in by head and ſhoulders, to witneſſe againſt the Popes ſupremacy a hundred yeers after it was taken from him, by their forefathers who produce it: but upon that true antiquity, which, having endured the ſhock of almoſt a thouſand yeeres, Sir *Henry* hath delivered a little before, *pag.* 105. tranſcribed out of Venerable *Bedes* Hiſtory of the Church of *England*, l. 2. c. 2. wherein every one may read, that when St. *Auguſtine*, in his diſpute with the Britans, at the firſt meeting, demanded their conformity to the Church of *Rome* in the celebration of *Eaſter* and *Baptiſme*, and that they would joyn with him in preaching the Goſpel to the Heathen *Saxons*, and could not otherwiſe incline them to it, he offered to try by *miracle*, whether he or they were in the right; whether he did wel in demanding, or they ill in refuſing: which, the *Britans*

tans failing, he effectually performed, miraculously giving sight to a blind man: And when, in the second meeting he found them stil refractory to his proposals, he prophetically foretold Gods revenge, which soon after fell upon them.

That *miracle* and divine vengeance more then sufficiently prove, that St. *Augustine*, sent by the Pope, came in the Name of God, from a lawful authority; and that his demands of conformity to the Church of *Rome* in the points specified, were good, and to be yeelded to by the Britans. Miracles, the proper works of the Almighty, and proper seales of his Missives, being never wrought to confirm unlawful missions or false Doctrines. And were there no other exception against the Cambrian pretended Testimony, but that *Miracle*; it clearly evidences, that when, and by whomsoever it was first written, the Author was either very ignorant, or in a worse error, and that there was more obedience due to the Pope from those of *Bangor* and all other Christians, then acknowledged by it.

I wish the present refractory opposers of the Roman Church, and her Missionaries, sent by the same Authority, to preach the same doctrine with St. *Augustine*, would reflect

reflect without prejudice on that *miracle*, and prediction of divine revenge: they are a seasonable theame for the present Pulpit.

FINIS.